



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



40.

837.







STRICTURES

ON SOME PARTS

OF THE OXFORD TRACT SYSTEM, ESPECIALLY AS IT IS
DEVELOPED IN THE 80TH AND 83RD TRACTS.

A CHARGE,

DELIVERED TO THE

CLERGY OF THE ARCHDEACONRY OF ELY,
AT A
VISITATION,

HELD IN THE

PARISH CHURCH OF ST. MICHAEL'S, CAMBRIDGE,

On Thursday, May the 21st, 1840.

WITH A COPIOUS

APPENDIX,

CONTAINING, AMONGST OTHER MATTER, AN ABRIDGMENT OF
MEDE'S APOSTASY OF THE LATTER TIMES.

BY

THE REV. J. H. BROWNE, M.A.

ARCHDEACON OF ELY, RECTOR OF COTGRAVE, AND FORMERLY FELLOW OF
ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

Published at the request of the Clergy.

Prove all things; hold fast that which is good. 1 *Thess.* v. 21.

Disputes are certainly necessary where fundamental truths are attacked and to be defended, or when very dangerous errors are broached—*Maxims of Piety. Bp. Wilson's Works.* Vol. 1. p. 330.

LONDON:

J. HATCHARD & SON, PICCADILLY.

DEARDEN, STAVELEY, AND OLIVER, NOTTINGHAM;
DEIGHTONS, CAMBRIDGE.

1840.

837.

W. D. BIRD & SONS, NOTTINGHAM.



TO THE
CLERGY OF THE ARCHDEACONRY OF ELY,

THE FOLLOWING

C H A R G E,

PUBLISHED AT THEIR REQUEST,

IS

MOST RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED,

BY

THEIR FAITHFUL AND OBEDIENT SERVANT,

THE AUTHOR.

Cotgrave, Sept. 1st, 1840.



40.

837.





adulterate the purity of its doctrines—to diminish its claims upon our attachment and veneration, by disparaging the merits of those holy men who effected, under the Divine blessing, the great work of the Reformation, should not only be viewed with distrust and suspicion, but, if I mistake not, should be met by the most firm and vigorous resistance.

As the errors, to which I have alluded, bear a singular affinity to those which are incorporated with the papal system, consistency in our Protestantism must require that, if we protest against the latter, we should not fail to protest against the former.* Had any doubts of that affinity existed in my mind, they would have been effectually dissipated by an avowal, which is made in the preface to two additional volumes of the remains of a deceased contributor to the *Tracts for the Times*. After vindicating the writer from some strictures which had been made upon his journal, and assigning reasons which, in the judgment of his editors, ought to withhold the theological student from broadly and positively condemning the author for wishing “to have nothing to do with such a set” as the principal Reformers; they proceed to say:—“And this more especially, if he take into consideration likewise certain less palpable, but not less substantial, differences in the way of thinking and moral sentiments, which separate the Reformers from the Fathers, more widely, perhaps, than any definite statements of doctrine. Compare the sayings and manners of the two schools on the subjects of fasting, celibacy,

* See Appendix, No. 1.

religious vows, voluntary retirement and contemplation, the memory of the saints, rites and ceremonies recommended by antiquity, and involving any sort of self-denial, and especially on the great point of giving men divine knowledge, and introducing holy associations, not indiscriminately, but as men are able to bear it; there can be little doubt that, generally speaking, the tone of the fourth century is so unlike that of the sixteenth, on each and all of these topics, that it is impossible for the same mind to sympathise with both. You must choose between the two lines: they are not only diverging, but contrary." *

It cannot be denied that this most remarkable passage possesses the merit of placing the controversy between the writers of the Oxford Tracts and their opponents upon clear, distinct, and intelligible grounds. After such an avowal there can be no wavering,—no vacillating between the two systems,—no futile and nugatory attempt to combine a deference to the opinions of the Reformers with a submission to patristic authority. A line of distinction is drawn, which precludes the possibility of any approximation between the contending parties. The points at issue are too numerous; and of far too great practical consequence, to admit of any compromise. The questions in debate are not of an abstract, speculative, and theoretical nature, upon which diversity of sentiment may be conscientiously entertained, without the slightest estrangement of feeling. On the

* Remains of the late Reverend R. H. Frowde. Part 2nd., vol. i. Preface, p. xxxiii.—See Appendix ii.

contrary, they include, either directly or collaterally, some of those tenets which characterise the apostacy of the latter days.* If the germs of that apostacy may be easily detected in the writings of the Fathers of the fourth century—if the seeds of papal superstition were then profusely scattered in the Christian Church—if the mystery of iniquity, which had begun to work in the days of St. Paul, were more fully unfolded in that century, and in a course of progressive development, till, in due time, every impediment being removed, it attained to the full revelation of the man of sin ;—then it is obvious that there can be no sympathy between those, on the one hand, who venerate the Reformers, espouse the doctrines which they espoused, and reject the corruptions which they rejected ; and those on the other, who disown their authority, and, substituting that of the Fathers of the fourth century in its stead, take up a position, which is, to a considerable extent, occupied in common by themselves, and by the Church of Rome.

To corroborate the statement which has here been made, it will be sufficient to adduce some specimens of the erroneous tenets and superstitious usages of that period, extracted from Cyril's Catechetical Lectures, a new translation of which has been put forth by the ardent partisans of patristic lore.

Celibacy is one of the points which have been specified as placing the Fathers and the Reformers, and, consequently, their respective adherents, in irreconcilable contrariety to each other. On this point let Cyril be

* See Appendix iii.

heard :—"As to the doctrines of chastity," says this writer of the fourth century, "let the order of Solitaries and of Virgins attend to it, who are establishing in the world an angelic life ; and then the rest of the Church's people also. Great is the crown laid up for you, brethren."* Again, speaking of the grace of the Holy Spirit, he says :—"Consider, I pray, of each nation, Bishops, Priests, Deacons, Solitaries, Virgins, and other laity ; and then behold the great protector and dispenser of their gifts ;—how throughout the world he gives to one chastity, to another perpetual virginity, to another almsgiving, to another voluntary poverty, to another power of repelling hostile spirits."†

* Cyril's Catechetical Lectures. Lect. iv., § 5. 24.

† Ib. Lect. xvi., § 5. 22. In the learned Joseph Mede's unanswerable treatise on "The Apostacy of the latter times," of which the reader will find a concise outline in Appendix iii. ; these "Solitaries," who are so highly eulogized by Cyril, are thus spoken of :—"Prohibition of marriage and difference of meats are inseparable characters of monastical profession, and, therefore, common to all that crew of hypocrites, whether Solivagant Eremites, or Anchorites, which live alone ; or Cœnobites, which live in society."—Mede's Works. B. iii., c. vii., p. 849. The following extract from Mosheim will not only supply the reader with a further delineation of the character of these Solitaries or Anchorites, and their associates in superstition, extravagance and fanaticism, but will likewise afford additional evidence that some of the most repulsive features of popery do not possess quite so much novelty as certain writers are disposed to ascribe to it :—"The monastic order, of which we have been taking a general view, was distributed into several classes. It was first divided into two distinct orders, of which one received the denomination of Cœnobites, the other that of Eremites. The former lived together in a fixed habitation, and made up one large community under a chief, whom they called *father*, or *abbot*, which signifies the same thing in the Egyptian language. The latter drew out a wretched life in perfect solitude, and were scattered here and there in caves, in deserts, in the hollow of rocks, sheltered from the wild beasts only by the

The most zealous and devoted Romanist cannot repose greater faith in the efficacy of the signature of the cross, than is evinced in the following passage :—" Let us not then be ashamed to confess the crucified. Be the cross

cover of a miserable cottage, in which each one lived sequestered from the rest of his species.

"The Anchorites were yet more excessive in the austerity of their manner of living, than the Eremites. They frequented the wildest deserts without either tents or cottages; nourished themselves with the roots and herbs which grew spontaneously out of the uncultivated ground; wandered about without having any fixed abode, and reposing wherever the approach of night happened to find them; and all this, that they might *avoid the view and the society of mortals*.

"The last order of monks that come now under consideration were those wandering fanatics, or rather impostors, whom the Egyptians called Sarabaites, who, instead of procuring a subsistence by honest industry, travelled through various cities and provinces, and gained a maintenance by fictitious miracles, by selling relics to the multitude, and other frauds of a like nature.

"Many of the Cœnobites were chargeable with vicious and scandalous practices. This order, however, was not so universally corrupt as that of the Sarabaites, who were, for the most part, profligates of the most abandoned kind. As to the Eremites, they seem to have deserved no other reproach than that of a delirious and extravagant fanaticism. All these different orders were hitherto composed of the *laity*, and were subject to the jurisdiction and the inspection of the bishops. But many of them were now adopted among the *clergy*, and that even by the command of the emperors. Nay, the fame of monastic piety and sanctity became so universal, that bishops were frequently chosen out of that fanatical order.

"If the enthusiastic frenzy of the monks exaggerated, in a manner pernicious to the interests of morality, the discipline that is obligatory upon Christians; the interests of virtue and true religion suffered yet more grievously by two monstrous errors which were almost universally adopted in this century, and became a source of innumerable calamities and mischiefs in the succeeding ages. The first of these maxims was, that *it was an act of virtue, to deceive and lie, when by that means the interests of the Church might be promoted*; and the second equally horrible, though in another point of view, was, that *errors in religion, when maintained and adhered to after proper admonition, were punishable with civil penalties and corporal tortures*. The former of these erroneous maxims was now of a long standing; it had been

our seal made with boldness by our fingers on our brow and in every thing ; over the bread we eat, and the cups we drink ; in our comings in and our goings out ; before our sleep, when we lie down and when we wake ; when we are in the way, and when we are still. Great is that preservative : it is without price, for the poor's sake ; without toil for the sick ; since also its grace is from God." *

But to the next extract I must solicit your more especial attention as containing the elements of three of the worst corruptions of the Church of Rome. In his Lecture on the Communion Service, Cyril says :—
 “Then, after the spiritual sacrifice is perfected, the bloodless service upon that sacrifice of propitiation, we

adopted for some ages past, and had produced an incredible number of ridiculous fables, fictitious prodigies, and pious frauds, to the unspeakable detriment of that glorious cause in which they were employed. And it must be frankly confessed, that the greatest men, and most eminent saints of this century, were more or less tainted with the infection of this corrupt principle, as will appear evidently to such as look with an attentive eye into their writings and actions. We would willingly except from this charge AMBROSE, and HILARY, AUGUSTINE, GREGORY NAZIANZEN, and JEROME ; but truth, which is more respectable than these venerable fathers, obliges us to involve them in the general accusation. We may add also, that it was, probably, the contagion of this pernicious maxim, that engaged SULPITIUS SEVERUS, who is far from being, in the general, a puerile or credulous historian, to attribute so many miracles to St. MARTIN. The other maxim, relating to the justice and expediency of punishing error, was introduced with those serene and peaceful times which the accession of CONSTANTINE to the imperial throne procured to the church. It was from that period approved by many, enforced by several examples during the contests that arose with the Priscillianists and Donatists, confirmed and established by the authority of Augustine, and thus transmitted to the following ages.”—Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History. Vol. i., p. 308.

* Cyril's Catechetical Lectures. Lect. xiii., § 5. 36.

entreat God for the common peace of the Church ; for the tranquillity of the world ; for kings ; for soldiers and allies ; for the sick ; for the afflicted ; and in a word, for all who stand in need of succour, we all supplicate and offer this sacrifice. Then we commemorate also those who have fallen asleep before us, first, Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs, that at their prayers and intervention, God would receive our petition. Afterwards also on behalf of the holy Fathers and Bishops who have fallen asleep before us ; and, in a word, of all who in past years have fallen asleep among us, believing that it will be a very great advantage to the souls, for whom the supplication is put up, while that holy and most awful sacrifice is presented."*

In the preceding extract you cannot fail instantaneously to detect the rudiments of the invocation of the saints—of purgatory,—and of the sacrifice of the mass for the quick and the dead. You will, therefore, not be surprised to learn that a writer in the *Dublin Review* (of which Dr. Wiseman is the reputed editor) should remark that "a better selection of ancient Catholic teaching could not have been made by the editors."† It is scarcely necessary to observe that what thus possesses a claim upon the approbation of the enemies of the Reformation, must excite widely different feelings in the minds of it's friends.

* Cyril's Catechetical Lectures. Lect. xxiii., § 8. 9.

† The *Dublin Review*, No. xiii., August, 1839, p. 24. At p. 25, the same writer alludes to Cyril as speaking of the Eucharist, "as a sacrifice of thanksgiving and propitiation for the living and the dead."

But the question which is fraught with the most serious consequences, and which, therefore, demands your most thoughtful consideration is that which the editors of Frowde's Remains designate "the great point of giving men divine knowledge, and introducing holy associations, not indiscriminately, but as men are able to bear it;" or, as it is expressed in the title page of a tract which has already excited much attention:—"Reserve in communicating religious knowledge." The nature of this reserve, as practised in the ancient Church, may be illustrated by the following quotation from Cyril's Catechetical Lectures. "To hear the gospel is allowed to all : but the glory of the gospel is set apart for them who are truly Christ's. Therefore our Lord spake in parables to them who were not able to hear ; but to his disciples he expounded them privately : for the righteousness of glory is for the illuminated, but blindness for the unbelievers. These mysteries which the Church now speaks to thee who art removed from among the Catechumens, it is not the custom to speak to Gentiles : for to a Gentile we speak not the mysteries concerning the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, nor before Catechumens do we discourse plainly about mysteries ; but many things many times we speak in a covert manner, that the faithful who know may understand, and that those who know not may receive no hurt."*

It must readily be admitted that such a procedure is essentially at variance with the practice of our Reformers.

* Cyril's Catechetical Lectures. Lect. vi., § 5. 29. See Appendix iv.

It is equally obvious that all who are imbued with the spirit of the Reformation and make it their prevailing aim, not to handle the Word of God deceitfully, but by manifestation of the truth to commend themselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God, can have very little sympathy with those who act upon this principle of reserve and concealment.

As the author of the tract on Reserve has applied this principle to the fundamental doctrine of the atonement, and as the moral influence of this doctrine in the renovation of man's fallen nature, by inspiring him with a hatred of sin, and a love of holiness, is of no less paramount importance than its efficacy in cancelling his guilt; I trust that our time will not be misemployed if we enter upon a brief investigation of this principle, when viewed in more especial reference to the members of the Church of England. My reason for thus restricting the enquiry is, that it may be simplified and disembarassed from some difficulties, with which it might otherwise be encumbered.

As a preliminary step to such an enquiry, it may not be irrelevant to observe that the gospel of Christ must be contemplated as an infinitely wise and benevolent plan of love and mercy, for the deliverance of corrupt and guilty man, no less from the contaminating influence of sin, than from its penal consequences, whether it be committed anterior or subsequent to baptism. To the application of this gracious scheme, no limitation, as it appears to me, can be specified, but that of the irre-missible sin against the Holy Ghost: so that, wherever

sincere repentance toward God, and a lively faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ are found ; there the gratuitous promises of the gospel take their full effect. When, therefore, we read in the Psalms :—*Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered* ;—in Isaiah, *Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts : and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him ; and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon* ;—in Ezekiel, *Have I any pleasure at all that the wicked should die ? saith the Lord God : and not that he should turn from his ways and live ?*—when we hear the Divine Redeemer's encouraging declarations, *They that are whole have no need of the physician, but they that are sick ; I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance* : and, *All that the Father giveth me shall come to me : and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out* ;—when these declarations are confirmed by St. Paul in these words :—*This is a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners* ;—and when, finally, the chapter, which completes the canon of inspiration, addresses the following invitation to all, without distinction :—*The Spirit and the Bride say, come. And let him that heareth say, come. And let him that is athirst, come. And whosoever will, let him take of the water of life freely* ;—when, I say, we read these, and other passages of a like nature, shall any one instil into our minds the belief that they are applicable only to the instances of primary conversion from Judaism and Gentilism to Christianity, and not to those who,

having been admitted into the Christian Church by baptism, have afterwards swerved from their baptismal engagements? Shall any one presume thus to make the gospel of Christ of none effect, by blindly adhering to the traditions of the ancient Church? Whosoever ventures to do this, incurs a fearful responsibility. Such a mode of interpreting Scripture tends to confirm sinners in their impenitence, by driving them to despair,—frustrates the gracious designs of the gospel—converts a large portion of the inspired volume into a dead letter, as being inapplicable to those who are born in a Christian land and baptized in their infancy—and counteracts the purpose of our blessed Lord's divine mission, which was, according to his own explicit intimation, *to seek and to save that which was lost*. It is, moreover, entirely inconsistent with the solemn charge addressed to us at our ordination, (a charge strictly in unison with our Saviour's words) when we are reminded that it is our office "to seek for Christ's sheep that are dispersed abroad, and for his children, who are in the midst of this naughty world, that they may be saved through Christ for ever." *

In the discharge of this office, and, especially in preaching and using "both public and private monitions and exhortations as well to the sick as to the whole," nothing can be more manifest than the indispensable necessity of duly appreciating the extent and magnitude of the moral evils which it is our business to correct. If by the adoption of a theological system, which is

* See Appendix v.

acknowledged by its partisans to be at variance with that of the Reformers, we are led to imagine that the aggregate of sin and wickedness, by which we are surrounded, is less than it really is; or if, in the application of the remedy which the gospel provides for man's guilt and depravity, we are under the influence of erroneous views, the result must be irretrievably fatal to those who are committed to our care. Should a physician mistake the symptoms of a disease—be unconscious of its malignity—ignorant of its fatal tendency—or evince a want of skill and judgment in the treatment of it, the consequences to be anticipated, in either case, are equally disastrous.

The train of argument, which I am about to pursue, relates, neither to those who are immersed in the darkness of Pagan ignorance and idolatry, nor to all, without distinction, who profess and call themselves Christians: but, as I have already observed, exclusively to the members of the Church of England. Although it is a part of our duty, as we may have opportunity, to recover and bring back to its fold those who have gone astray from it; yet our chief concern is with such as are within its pale, and to them our public ministrations are directed.

If, then, we proceed to form an estimate of the moral condition of our respective parishes, and institute a careful and anxious scrutiny into their spiritual state, what will be the result? Shall we, for the most part, have reason to believe that the larger proportion of our people have preserved their baptismal covenant inviolate,

and have never forgotten the impressive signature of the cross, by which they were pledged at all times to witness a good confession, and under the banners of the great Captain of their salvation to maintain an unceasing conflict with the enemies of their souls? Or, rather, will not the painful conclusion be forced upon our minds, whether we be willing to give it admission or not; that the great majority of baptized Christians have shamefully deserted the standard under which they were enlisted, and have been forgetful of their solemn vows and renunciations? * Must not the incontrovertible evidence of facts constrain us painfully to acknowledge that too many have received the grace of God in vain, and that, whatever may be the nature and extent of baptismal grace, with regard to multitudes, it has become wholly inoperative, and, by enhancing their responsibility, has left them under an increased load of guilt? I speak not of the openly immoral, flagitious, and profane alone. I pass over the drunkard, the debauchee, the swearer,

* The following observations of Cyril on the renunciation of the "works of Satan and all his pomp," are deserving of attention:—"Then in the second sentence thou art told to say, 'and all his works.' Now the works of Satan are all sin, which it is necessary to renounce also;—just as if a man has escaped a tyrant, he would have doubtless escaped his instruments also. All sin, therefore, according to its kinds, is included in the works of the devil. Then thou sayest, 'and all his pomp.' Now the pomp of the devil is the madness of shows, and horse-races, and hunting, and all such vanity: from which that holy man, (the Psalmist) praying to be delivered, says unto God, *Turn away mine eyes from beholding vanity.* Be not interested in the madness of the shows, where thou wilt behold the wanton gestures of players, carried on with mockeries and all unseemliness, and the frantic dancing of effeminate men. Shun also horse-races, that frantic spectacle, which subverts souls. For all these are pomps of the devil."—Cyril's Catechetical Lectures. Lect. xix., § 55. 5. 6.

and the Sabbath-breaker ;—though, alas ! too many of these are to be found amongst us. I would turn your attention to others of a more dubious and equivocal description. The proud, the vindictive, the covetous,—all who are living in conformity to the sinful fashions of a world that *lieth in wickedness* ; all who are *lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God* ; all such characters as these, however free they may be from the stain of the grosser sins, must be included in the numbers who are not fulfilling the stipulations of their baptismal covenant. Against them the curse of the broken law is explicitly denounced. Such men are described, in the language of inspiration, as minding *the things of the flesh*—as being *carnally-minded*. But *the carnal mind is enmity against God : for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can it be* ; and, *they that are in the flesh cannot please God*.

It would be superfluous to adduce any arguments to prove that such persons are in an awful state of condemnation. Besides the guilt incurred by each specific infringement of the precepts of the moral law, there is the aggravation resulting from the forfeiture of invaluable privileges, and the violation of solemn vows. Besides the original tendencies to evil interwoven with man's fallen nature, there are the superinduced habits of sinful indulgence which disqualify the soul for communion with God on earth, and for the spiritual enjoyments and felicity of a future state. So that, until the imputation of sin be removed, and the reigning power of sin be dethroned, no admission can be gained to the king-

dom of heaven. The having been "made a child of God" in baptism, will be of no more avail to the man, who names the name of Christ, while he neglects to depart from iniquity, than the rite of circumcision was to the boastful Jews, who vaunted themselves in being Abraham's children, while they neglected to do the works of Abraham.

Is then, all hope excluded? Can there be no plenary remission of sin after baptism,—no reinstatement in the Divine favour,—no reinvestiture in the escheated inheritance? *Will the Lord cast off for ever? And will he be favourable no more? Is his mercy clean gone for ever? Doth his promise fail for evermore? Hath God forgotten to be gracious? Hath he in anger shut up his tender mercies?* Far be it from us to impute such implacability to that great and glorious Being, of whom St. John gives us this concise, but emphatic character, *God is love!* Such is not the tenor of his dealings with penitent sinners, who have been admitted into that covenant of grace and mercy which was ratified by the blood of his only-begotten and well-beloved Son. They are placed—not under the *ministration of death*—but under the *ministration of the Spirit*, and, therefore, a way of reconciliation is opened to their view; and the means of moral renovation are offered to their acceptance.

To us, my Reverend Brethren, is delegated the important office of pointing out that way; and by the preaching of the word and administration of the sacraments, of indicating and dispensing those means. To

us is committed *the ministry of reconciliation*. In the discharge of our high commission as *Ambassadors for Christ*, instead of aggravating the horrors of an awakened conscience—instead of driving the trembling penitent to the brink of desperation,*—instead of sternly repelling his advances towards the throne of grace (such is the unspeakable love and mercy of the Deity!) we are bound to convince him that the only obstacles to peace, between him and his offended God, are to be found in impenitence and unbelief: and, further, we are even authorized to entreat him to lay aside the enmity which lurks in his own breast, and to be *reconciled to God*. Shall we, then, in the fulfilment of our Ambassage, deem ourselves warranted to employ our own discretion in imparting or withholding the terms of peace? Shall we rashly presume to abridge and circumscribe the freeness of the Divine mercy, and to fetter its exercise with conditions, which, whatever countenance they may derive from tradition, can find no sanction in the inspired volume? Shall we think it

* “For as in all other things men’s hearts do quail and faint, if they once perceive that they travail in vain; even so most especially in this matter must we take heed, and beware that we suffer not ourselves to be persuaded that all we do is but labour lost; for thereof either sudden desperation doth arise, or a licentious boldness to sin, which at length bringeth unto desperation. Lest any such thing then should happen unto them, he doth certify them of the grace and goodness of God, who is always most ready to receive them into favour again that turn speedily unto him. Which thing he doth prove with the same title wherewith God doth describe and set forth himself unto Moses, speaking on this manner; *For he is gracious and merciful, slow to anger, of great kindness, and repenteth of the evil.*”—Homilies, p. 451, 8vo.

expedient to conceal from the sinner's knowledge those incentives which are best adapted to rouse him from his lethargy, and to stimulate him to recover himself from his lapsed condition? Shall we dare to invert the order of the gospel, and call upon him to work, before we have presented to him the most efficacious motives for action? Shall we adopt the principle of reserve, and "give men divine knowledge, and introduce holy associations, not indiscriminately, but as men are able to bear it?" However such a course may be in unison with the system of the ancient Church, its advocates have distinctly admitted (as we have already seen) that it is not in accordance with the practice of the Reformers. To my mind it appears equally incompatible with the notion of our being, in the language of St. Paul — *faithful stewards of the mysteries of God*; or, in that of St. Peter, — *good stewards of the manifold grace of God*.

My own firm and unalterable belief has ever been, that the institution of piacular sacrifices was coeval with the fall of Adam, and that it was transmitted by Noah and his family from the Antediluvian to the Postdiluvian world. Faith in the divine origin of this institution, as well as in its typical import, was the reason of the acceptance of Abel's sacrifice; when, through want of this faith, the bloodless offering of Cain was rejected: for the unalterable decree had been promulgated in heaven, and, most probably, communicated to the exiled family of Adam, that, *without shedding of blood is no remission*. The universality of the custom of making sacrificial offerings by the immolation of victims, not

only in the line of the Patriarchs, but also amongst all the heathen nations of antiquity, indicates its derivation from one common source, and constitutes a tradition, the validity and authority of which can never be impeached. When, however, we descend to the establishment of the civil and religious polity of the Jews, we find that the system of making expiatory offerings, by the death of animals, became the subject of distinct and positive enactment. In St. Paul's epistle to the Hebrews we have the most conclusive evidence that the bloody sacrifices prescribed by the Mosaic law were intended to typify and prefigure that great atonement which, in the fulness of time, was to be made upon Mount Calvary, and, like the illustrious harbinger of the Messiah, to point to the *Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world*. So that the doctrine of the atonement, whether viewed in anticipation through the dim perspective of types and shadows, or viewed retrospectively as having been completely established by the great propitiatory sacrifice of the cross, has ever been the sole foundation of the enlightened believer's hope of pardon, from the time of man's first apostacy, to the present day. Well, therefore, may we determine, without any scruple or hesitation, like St. Paul, *to preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness ; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God*.*

* Bishop Wilson thus begins a sermon on 1 Cor. ii. 2—*I determined not to know any thing among you, save Jesus Christ and him crucified*,—"This was

But it is contended by the writer of the Tract on Reserve, that, to bring forward "the atonement explicitly and prominently on all occasions," "is quite opposed to the teaching of scripture," and finds no sanction in the gospels;—that, "if the epistles of St. Paul appear to favour it, it is only at first sight;"—that, "it is a great mistake to suppose that, by preaching the atonement, we are preaching what St. Paul meant by Christ crucified;" that, in fact, by the latter expression, "he always intends the opposite to the modern notion;"—and that, as it is used by the Apostles, when combined with our Saviour's declaration, he that cometh after me must take up his cross daily and follow me, it

the foundation of all St. Paul's sermons; as it ought to be of ours: this being the *power of God, and the wisdom of God*, to regain the world out of the hands of Satan, and to save souls from eternal ruin."—The Works of the Right Reverend Thomas Wilson, D.D., Lord Bishop of Sodor and Man, vol. ii. p. 397.—To the same effect, George Cranmer, whom Isaac Walton designates as Hooker's "dear pupil," observes in a letter to his valued Master, "The chiefest labour of a Christian should be to know; of a Minister to *preach Christ crucified*: in regard whereof, not only worldly things, but things otherwise precious, even the Discipline itself is vile and base."—Appendix to Hooker's Life, prefixed to the folio edition of his Works, p. 33,—The following extract from a communication transmitted by the present exemplary Bishop of Calcutta relative to the religious awakening at Kishnagur, may be considered as a practical illustration of the great truth here inculcated.—"I pause," says this pious prelate, "to call the Society's attention to this point: the Kurta-Bhojas uniformly seize on the doctrine of the atonement, they say, 'This is what we have been seeking for.' It seems that their notion of obtaining a sight of God is met by the doctrine of a God incarnate suffering for man. Thus our Missionaries, like St. Paul, know nothing among their converts, but *Jesus Christ and him crucified*; which, though still a stumbling block to some, and folly to others, is *Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God*, to them that are called of all nations, and kindreds, and tongues, and people."—See Appendix, vi.

implies—"that we cannot approach God without a sacrifice—a sacrifice on the part of human nature in union with that of our Saviour." *

Fully to unravel the tissue of error which pervades the preceding extracts, would occupy too much time. But as they relate to a doctrine which is the cornerstone of the fabric of Christianity, they must not be passed over altogether unnoticed.

When it is considered that, four thousand years before the great vicarious sacrifice was offered up on the cross, expiatory oblations were introduced, most probably, (as I have already remarked) in consequence of some specific mandate from heaven;—when it is further considered that the practice of making them was not only perpetuated, through the patriarchal succession, but became mixed up with all the idolatries of Paganism, and was incorporated with the Jewish economy;—when these facts are duly weighed, it does, indeed, seem a startling proposition to affirm,—after the Son of God, who was both the Priest and the Victim, had fulfilled all that had been prefigured and foretold, and, amidst the shaking of the earth, the rending of the rocks, the obscuration of the sun, and the rifting of the veil of the temple, proclaimed to the world—*It is finished* †—that

* Tracts for the Times, No. 80, pp. 74. 75.—See Appendix, vii.

† The reader will find the following beautiful and impressive apostrophe in Bishop Hall's justly celebrated "Passion Sermon;"—"Hear this, thou languishing and afflicted soul! There is not one of thy sins, but it is paid for; not one of thy debts in the scroll of God, but it is crossed; not one farthing of all thine infinite ransom is unpaid. Alas! thy sins, thou sayest, are ever before thee, and God's indignation goes still over thee; and thou

it is contrary to the teaching of scripture to give prominence to the doctrine of the atonement.

Such, at least, was not the mode of expounding scripture which was adopted by him, who could not err in its interpretation. At the mysterious interview which he had with two of his disciples, immediately after he was risen from the dead, he took occasion to rectify the errors, under which they laboured, by elucidating from the writings of the Old Testament, the astonishing facts of which they had recently been witnesses. He found that all their thoughts and conversation were engrossed by the absorbing interest of the events which had just occurred. Perceiving that their spirits were saddened and dejected by the frustration of those hopes of national glory and preeminence, which they had always been accustomed to associate with the manifestation of their expected Messiah, he reproved them for their weakness and unbelief, and corrected their misapprehensions by an appeal to the scriptures. *Then he said unto them, O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken : ought not Christ to have suffered these*

goest mourning all the day long, and with that pattern of distress, criest out, in the bitterness of thy soul—*I have sinned, what shall I do to thee, O thou preserver of men ?—What should'st thou do ?—Turn and believe.* Now thou art stung in thy conscience with this fiery serpent look up with the eyes of faith to this brazen serpent, Christ Jesus, and be healed. Behold, his head is humbly bowed down in a gracious respect to thee : his arms are stretched out lovingly to embrace thee ; yea, his precious side is open to receive thee, and his tongue interprets all these to thee for thine endless comfort ; *it is finished.* There is no more accusation, judgment, death, hell for thee : all these are no more to thee, than if they were not : *Who shall condemn ? It is Christ which is dead.*—Bishop Hall's Works. Pratt's edition. vol. v. p. 39.

things, and to enter into his glory? And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures, the things concerning himself. Can*

* In the account given by St. Luke, in the ninth chapter of his Gospel, of our Lord's transfiguration, the Evangelist states that, *there talked with him two men, which were Moses and Elias; who appeared in glory, and spake of his decease, which he should accomplish at Jerusalem.* As the subjects of discourse were undoubtedly upon both occasions the same, the learned Dr. Lightfoot, in a sermon upon these words, has connected the two passages together. The following are portions of his comment upon them, which may be regarded as strictly applicable to the point under discussion.—“Remember that Moses here is the law, and Elias the prophecy, and you have here an emblem of the Scriptures, which is, that *lex atque omnis prophetarum chorus Christi prænотat passionem,*’ that the law, and all the glorious company of the prophets, foretel Christ’s passion in their books; as, now Moses the giver of the law, and Elias the chief of the prophets, do speak to him mouth to mouth, and talk of *his decease, which he should accomplish at Jerusalem.*—This passion-sermon of Christ, made by Moses and Elias here, Christ himself makes the rehearsal of, Luke xxiv. 27. *And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them, in all the Scriptures, the things concerning himself:* I can hardly hold wishing, as before, oh! that this rehearsal might have come to us, or we come to this rehearsal!—But we have already what we ask; for, as our Saviour in the parable, Luke xvi. 29, we have Moses and the prophets still; let us hear them: for, as St. Paul, concerning the blood of Abel, they even still, though in silence; yet do preach concerning Christ and *his decease, which he should accomplish at Jerusalem.*”—Lightfoot’s Works. Pitman’s edit. vol. vi. pp. 200, 201. That nothing may be wanting to illustrate and confirm the fundamental truth contained in these words, or to expose and refute the opposite error, I will here subjoin the admirable exposition of them given by the present excellent Bishop of Chester, in his most useful and edifying lectures on the Gospels.—“Here then is proof, if proof were needed, of the great object of the incarnation. The subject which these conversed on, was not the bringing more clearly to man’s knowledge a future state of immortality, though life and immortality were brought to light by the Gospel; neither was it the stronger enforcement of the great rules of righteousness, though he did enforce these as the end of the commandment: but what they spake of was, *his decease which he should accomplish at Jerusalem:* the propitiation by which he should atone for sin, and reconcile man to God. This is what interested Moses and Elias, the things which *angels desire to look into:* the things belonging to our redemption. To this, therefore, our attention must

we, then, entertain any doubt relative to the manner in which our Saviour applied to himself the types and prophecies of the Old Testament? Must we not infer, without hesitation, that the doctrine of the atonement, as prefigured by the sacrificial rites of the Levitical law, and especially by the solemn anniversary of the great day of atonement, which was enjoined in that law, formed a leading and prominent topic of his communication with his two disciples on this deeply interesting occasion? Have we not every reason to suppose that our blessed Lord would especially insist upon the predictions contained in the fifty-third Chapter of the Prophet Isaiah, which refer to his humiliation, sufferings, and death, and to the end which was to be by them fulfilled;—in the same manner as Philip *opened his mouth* to the Treasurer of Queen Candace *and began at the same scripture, and preached unto him Jesus?*

But what shall be said of the allegation, that St. Paul meant by preaching Christ crucified directly the opposite to the modern notion of the atonement, *viz.*: our own crucifixion, in the mortification of the flesh? Is it not a strange paralogism to confound the effect with the cause,—the duty with the motive,—and, because St. Paul was enabled, by beholding the cross of Christ with the eye of faith, to trample the world under his feet, and to crucify his flesh, with its affections and lusts; to argue, that, when he gloried in that cross, it was not because thereon the glorious work of human redemption

first be fixed; how *Christ once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God.*—Exposition of the Gospel of St. Luke. Vol. i. p. 192.

was achieved, and an adequate atonement was made for his own sins, and for those of all mankind—but because he thence derived the most powerful inducements to strive after a conformity to his Saviour's divine example?

The passages, upon which I have already animadverted, are, in my estimation, replete with error. When, however, the writer proceeds to state “that we cannot approach God without a sacrifice—a sacrifice on the part of human nature in union with that of our Saviour,” I shall leave such an assertion, without any comment, to your own reflections.

The truth is that the leading argument, which pervades the Tract in question, is sophistical and fallacious. It pleased God to exhibit some measure of reserve in his communications with those to whom he vouchsafed to make himself and his future counsels known. He saw fit to impart the light of revelation in a gradual and progressive manner, and to veil some of its sublimest truths in types and shadows, till the time appointed for their full disclosure had arrived. It seemed good, also, to the Son of God, in whom were hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, to practise, to a certain extent, a similar reserve, and to make known the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven to a select few, whom he had chosen to be the depositaries of those mysteries, and whose minds he had prepared for their reception. These examples are proposed for our imitation. So that, forsooth, because such a procedure was adopted by infallible wisdom, before the complete development of

the gracious plan of man's salvation ; it is to form a precedent for the guidance of fallible man, after that plan has been fully unfolded. Such a course of argumentation is obviously irrelevant and inconsequential in the highest degree. It is, moreover, most pointedly at variance with the express words of our Saviour. After having explained the parable of the Sower to his disciples apart from the multitude, he put to them this question,—*Is a candle brought to be put under a bushel, or under a bed ? and not to be set on a candlestick ? For there is nothing hid which shall not be manifested. Neither was any thing kept secret, but that it should come abroad.* *

It is, however, necessary to examine the bearing of this principle of reserve, in connexion with the fundamental doctrine of the atonement, upon the actual state and condition of those members of our Church, who are

* The advocates of the principle of reserve would do well to ponder attentively this passage, with Whitby's paraphrase upon it, which is here given. —“ These words being only spoken to Christ's disciples, when he was alone with them, and both here, and in Luke viii. 16, 17, subjoined to the explication of this parable, I think it best, to explain them accordingly. As if Christ had said,—‘ I give you a clear light, by which you may discern the import of this and other parables. But this I do, not that you may keep it to yourselves, and hide it from others, but that it may be beneficial to you, and by you be made beneficial to others ; and that having thus learned, you may instruct them how they ought to hear, and to receive the word heard in good and honest hearts. And though I give you the knowledge of these mysteries of the kingdom of God,—*καταμυσας*—privately, I do it not that you may keep them so ; for there is nothing (thus) hid which should not be made manifest, neither was any thing made secret (by me) but that it should (afterwards) come abroad.”—Whitby's Annotations on Mark iv. 21, 22.—See Appendix, viii.

pursuing a sinful course, and are not fulfilling the terms of the baptismal covenant.

That such a state is one of aggravated guilt cannot be denied. That the sinner, if he pass out of time into eternity with this guilt uncanceled, must be for ever excluded from heaven, is equally certain. How, then, is he to be transferred into a state of pardon and acceptance? In other words, to what must he look, as the sole ground of his justification before God—the sole means of the renewal of his claim to eternal happiness? Must he not place implicit reliance on the efficacy of that atonement, which his Saviour has made for his sins, as the exclusive foundation of his hopes of mercy? Shall he fondly imagine that by any mortification of the flesh—any acts of self-denial, however painful—any exercises of asceticism—any self-imposed austerities, he can liquidate some portion of the debt of ten thousand talents which he has contracted? Shall he impiously dare to place any sacrifice of his own, however great, in juxtaposition with the infinitely meritorious and costly sacrifice of the death of Christ? Shall he presumptuously suppose that any of his own performances must be added as supplementary to the finished work of the Redeemer, or that his own righteousness may be rendered partly instrumental in securing for himself an interest in that perfect righteousness, which is unto all and upon all them that believe? If he follow the corrupt traditions of the Church of Rome, many of which may be traced to the sanction of earlier writers, whose authority he is now taught by some to prefer to that of the

distinguished promoters of the Reformation, he will be in danger of falling into these pernicious errors. But if, in humble dependence on the illumination of the Holy Spirit, he takes that Scripture which was given by inspiration of God for the sole infallible guide of his judgment and conduct, bringing to the interpretation of it the effective aid supplied by the liturgy, articles, and homilies of the Church of which he is a member, he will find that the debt which he had incurred was cancelled on the cross, and that by such a faith in the doctrine of the atonement as worketh by love and produces the fruits of righteousness, he is made a partaker of all the benefits of his Saviour's passion. * Is, then, this doctrine to be withheld, and to be preached cautiously and sparingly, lest the convinced and awakened sinner should prematurely reap the comfort of it? Is a doctrine to be taught with reserve, which reconciles the seemingly conflicting attributes of justice and of mercy, and which, by the ineffable dignity and transcendent glory of the sufferer, exhibits, on the one hand, the most impressive manifestation of the dreadful malignity of sin; and, on the other, by the satisfaction made to the Divine Justice, leaves the penitent and contrite soul no room to doubt that God can be just and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus?

But there is another consideration of essential and supreme importance, which the advocates of the system of reserve seem entirely to have overlooked, and that is—it's obvious tendency to repress and extinguish the

* See Appendix, ix.

emotions of love, and to substitute in the room of this refined and exalted principle, a spirit of legal bondage and servile fear. Exactly in accordance with the declaration of our Blessed Lord that the two great commandments, in which are concentrated all the moral precepts scattered throughout the law and the prophets, are—love to God and love to man,—St. Paul affirms that *love is the fulfilling of the law*, and that *the end of the commandment is charity, out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience and a faith unfeigned*.—He even goes further : he pronounces a solemn denunciation on those who are destitute of love to their Redeemer ; *if any man*, says he, *love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema Maranatha*.—But how is this passion to be awakened and excited ? Assuredly by meditating with a stedfast faith on his unspeakable love to us ; especially as it was evinced by the atonement which he made for our sins upon the cross. *For the love of Christ constraineth us ; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead ; and that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again,**

* The connexion between love and obedience is precisely the same as that between faith and good works. Genuine love will produce consistent obedience ; and a lively faith, will be evidenced by good works. But love must have an object ; and if that object be of an invisible and spiritual nature, it must be apprehended by faith. The understanding, therefore, must be made acquainted with its excellencies and attributes, and with the benefits which it may have conferred, or may be capable of conferring upon us. The energy of faith and the fervency of love may be expected to be in proportion to the accuracy and extent of our knowledge in these respects. Consequently, to

To the same effect is the language of the beloved Apostle, who dilates still more fully in his first epistle on this heavenly grace. *He that loveth not knoweth not God; for God is love. In this was manifested the love of God towards us, because that God sent his only-begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins. Beloved, if God so loved us, we ought also to love one another.*

withhold the Scriptures, or to hesitate to declare the whole counsel of God, as therein revealed, for the salvation of man must, from the essential constitution of the human mind, have a necessary tendency to extinguish both faith and love.

The connexion between love and obedience is clearly pointed out by the Divine Author of our holy religion, in John xiv. 15. 21. 23. 24. *If ye love me keep my commandments. He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me. If a man love me, he will keep my words. He that loveth me not keepeth not my sayings.* Upon the 15th. verse the pious Burkitt makes the following useful practical reflections:—"In these words our Saviour implicitly reproves his disciples for their fond way of expressing their love to him, by doting upon his bodily presence, and sorrowing immoderately for his absence; and he expressly warns them to evidence their love to him by their obedience to his commands, *If ye love me, keep my commandments.* Where observe, Christ requires an obedient love, and loving obedience. Love without obedience is but dissimulation: obedience without love is but drudgery and slavery. Such a love as produces obedience, must be a dutiful love, a love of reverence and honour to him as a Commander;—and an operative and working love, a *labour of love*, as the Apostle calls it. Not waiters, but workers, are the best servants in Christ's esteem. And such an obedience as is the product of love, will be a willing, easy, and cheerful obedience, a pleasing and an acceptable obedience, a constant and abiding obedience. All other motives without love are servile and base, and beget in us the drudgery of a slave, but not the duty of a son. He that only fears God, is afraid of smarting: but he that loves God, is afraid of offending."—Burkitt's Commentary, in loco.

It is here distinctly intimated that the great propitiatory sacrifice which our Blessed Lord offered for the sins of the world, and which possessed an infinite value from the mysterious union of the Divine nature with the human, was such an evidence of the love of the Deity, as ought to kindle in our breasts a corresponding love to God and man. And can it for a moment be questioned whether love be not the most acceptable, as well as the most efficacious motive to obedience that can actuate a rational and intelligent being? Or can it be supposed that a system which has a palpable tendency to create doubt, distrust, and terror, is more likely to reclaim the wicked from their fatal wanderings, than one which possesses every requisite for inspiring hope, confidence, and love?

To the preceding consideration it may be added, that the principle of reserve in communicating religious knowledge in general, as well as with reference to the doctrine of the atonement in particular, has not only a withering and blighting influence on the palmary grace of love, but is also equally injurious to the Christian's peace and joy. Peace was the precious legacy which our Blessed Lord bequeathed to his disciples,—*peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you.* St. Paul affectionately prays in behalf of his Thessalonian converts,—*now the Lord of peace himself give you peace always by all means!* But his words to the Colossians are still more to the point—*For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell; and having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile*

all things to himself. No arguments need be advanced to shew that this peace cannot be enjoyed by any one who is ignorant of the availableness of that blood, which was shed upon the cross, for the purposes of pardon and reconciliation ; or, who is taught to believe that it is only through a long course of preparatory discipline that he must expect to become a partaker of the benefits of his Saviour's passion. So likewise with regard to the sensation of joy : it would be mockery to call upon a man to rejoice in the Lord alway, who, when labouring under the anguish of an accusing conscience, was left in doubt and uncertainty with regard to the only effectual mode of relief.

At the same time it is carefully to be noted, that any degree of peace and joy which is dissevered from holiness of life and consistency of practice, cannot originate from a legitimate source. It may proceed from a constitutional buoyancy of spirits—or from great outward prosperity—or from mistaken views of Scripture—or from fanaticism—or from satanic delusion. It cannot flow from a justifying faith. The effect of such a faith must necessarily be to purify the heart. All the doctrines of the Gospel, which are its object, are doctrines according to godliness : and, therefore, when we teach the sinner to derive peace and joy from the cross of Christ, it is in order that the joy of the Lord may be his strength to enable him to vanquish temptation, and that, by a lively faith in the atonement, he may be encouraged to triumph over the world, the flesh, and the devil. It is clear that both St. Paul and St. Peter

recognised in the doctrine of Christ crucified the most powerful incentive to a godly life. The former reminds Titus that *our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works.* The latter speaks of our Lord's bearing *our sins in his own body on the tree, that we being dead to sin should live unto righteousness* : and then he sub-joins in the words of the prophet Isaiah,—*by whose stripes ye were healed.*

Let it also be observed, that when preferring the example of the Reformers to that of the ancient Fathers, we preach without reserve, to all indiscriminately, the doctrine of a gratuitous remission of sins through the atoning blood of the Lord Jesus Christ, or the cognate and equivalent doctrines of justification by faith and salvation through grace, we do not fail at the same time to inculcate the indispensable necessity of *repentance towards God*, and of that holiness, *without which no man shall see the Lord.* We do not, indeed, like the contemners of Jewel and the Reformation, confound faith and works, justification and sanctification : but we assign to each it's appropriate place in that dispensation of grace and mercy, under which it is the privilege of the members of the Church of England to live. To adopt the language of the judicious Hooker,—“ We ourselves do not teach Christ alone, excluding our own faith, unto justification ; Christ alone, excluding our own works, unto sanctification ; Christ alone, excluding the one or the other unnecessary unto salvation. It is

a childish cavil, wherewith in the matter of justification, our adversaries do so greatly please themselves, exclaiming, that we tread all Christian virtues under our feet, and require nothing in Christians but faith, because we teach that faith alone justifieth : whereas by this speech we never meant to exclude either hope or charity from being joined as inseparable mates with faith in the man that is justified ; or works from being added as necessary duties, required at the hands of every justified man : but to shew that faith is the only hand that putteth on Christ unto justification ; and Christ the only garment, which being so put on, covereth the shame of our defiled natures, hideth the imperfection of our works, preserveth us blameless in the sight of God, before whom otherwise, the weakness of our faith were cause sufficient to make us culpable, yea, to shut us from the kingdom of heaven, where no thing that is not absolute can enter.”*

* Discourse of Justification. Hooker's Works, p. 508, fol. edit.—To those who admire the writings of Hooker, and the formularies of our Church, it is interesting to trace the exactness with which he treads in the footsteps of the Reformers, upon this vital question. The coincidence between the extract from his celebrated Sermon given above, and the following quotation from Cranmer's Homily of Salvation is very striking, and, in my opinion, of great importance.—“ St. Paul declareth nothing upon the behalf of man concerning his justification, but only a true and lively faith, which nevertheless is the gift of God, and not man's only work without God. And yet that faith doth not shut out repentance, hope, love, dread, and the fear of God, to be joined with faith in every man that is justified ; but it shutteth them out from the office of justifying. So that although they be all present together in him that is justified, yet they justify not altogether : neither doth faith shut out the justice of our good works, necessarily to be done afterwards of duty towards God ; (for we are most bounden to serve God, in

Having considered the case of the inconsistent member of our Church, who has incurred the awful guilt of falsifying the engagements of his baptismal covenant, by living in the practice of habitual sin, with reference to the means and possibility of pardon ; I come now to consider the same case with reference to the equally important subject of sanctification.

It has always appeared to me that it would be a much more profitable employment of our time, and tend much more to that peace and union amongst ourselves, which are in every point of view so desirable, if, instead of engaging in interminable controversies relative to the measure and degree of regenerating grace imparted to infants in the sacrament of baptism, or to it's indefectibility, we directed their attention to the proofs of it's existence, when they became adults. With regard to the former point, all our debates and speculations can lead to no definite and certain conclusions : with regard to the latter, the Scriptures furnish us with criteria, which will, in most instances, preclude the possibility of any very material mistake. It is unnecessary for me to remind you, my Reverend Brethren, that these tests are profusely scattered throughout the first epistle of St. John.* As the epistles of St. Paul

doing good deeds, commanded by him in his holy Scripture, all the days of our life :) but it excludeth them, so that we may not do them to this intent, to be made just by doing of them."—Homilies, p. 19, 8vo. edit.

* I will here subjoin the passages to which I have alluded, in order that the reader may compare them together, and with those which are cited in the Charge.—*If ye know that he is righteous, ye know that every one that doeth righteousness is born of him.* 1 John, ii. 29. *Whosoever abideth in him sinneth*

to the Galatians may be studied with singular advantage for the purpose of gaining a clearer insight into the dangerous error of associating sacraments and the works of the moral law with the perfect righteousness of the Lord Jesus Christ, as the ground of our justification in the sight of God : so likewise may this epistle be studied with the same advantage, in order to investigate the bearing of those opinions which are now being disseminated with indefatigable zeal relative to the subject of baptismal regeneration, upon the equally important doctrine of sanctification.

It is of the utmost consequence that we should inquire whether those, who have in baptism been made the

not : whosoever sinneth hath not seen him, neither known him.—In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil : whosoever doth not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother.—We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren. He that loveth not his brother, abideth in death.—And he that keepeth his commandments dwelleth in him, and he in him. And hereby we know that he abideth in us, by the Spirit which he hath given us. 1 John, iii. 6, 10, 14, 24. Beloved, let us love one another ; for love is of God ; and every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God.—No man hath seen God at any time. If we love one another, God dwelleth in us, and his love is perfected in us. Hereby know we that we dwell in him, and he in us, because he hath given us of his Spirit. 1 John, iv. 7, 12, 13.—Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God : and every one that loveth him that begat, loveth him also that is begotten of him.—For whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world : and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith.—He that hath the Son hath life ; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life.—We know that whosoever is born of God sinneth not ; but he that is begotten of God keepeth himself, and that wicked one toucheth him not. 1 John, v. 1, 4, 12, 18.—If the reader will compare the preceding texts with St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, chap. viii., from v. 1 to 14, and his Epistle to the Galatians, chap. v. from v. 16 to the end, he will find the same precise and unequivocal marks of the distinction between the regenerate and unregenerate character in the writings of St. Paul that he does in those of St. John.

children of God, the members of Christ, and heirs of the kingdom of heaven, are leading the rest of their lives according to that beginning ;—whether, as they advance towards maturity of reason and understanding, they afford any satisfactory evidence that they are actually living under the sanctifying influence of the Holy Spirit : because if they have not their fruit unto holiness, their end will not be everlasting life. This is a most serious enquiry, upon the result of which there depends nothing less than the prospect of eternal happiness, or eternal misery to those who are the subjects of it. Let us, then, turn to 1 John, iii. 7, and we shall there find the question decided. *Little children*, says the Apostle, *let no man deceive you : he that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as he is righteous.* As if he had said,—let no man deceive you with the notion of your being in a regenerate state, if you can discern in the spirit of your mind,—in your habitual conduct,—in the language of your lips,—in the motives by which you are actuated, none of the signs or tokens of regeneration : for he alone who brings forth the fruit of righteousness is intrinsically a righteous man, endeavouring to copy that pattern of perfect and unblemished righteousness, which was exhibited in the life and conversation of his Saviour. On the other hand, the Apostle subjoins in the verse following—*he that committeth sin is of the devil.* Upon these words, Dean Tucker, as quoted in Bishop's Mant's Bible, very justly remarks, —“ that he who wilfully and habitually commits sin, whatever evidence of his new birth or justification, his

adoption or acceptance, he may fancy himself possessed of, is actually no other than the servant of sin, and the slave of the devil."

Again, in the ninth verse of the same chapter, we read that—*whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin ; for his seed remaineth in him, and he cannot sin, because he is born of God.** When it is affirmed that *whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin ;* the converse of the proposition is evidently implied, viz. that whosoever commits sin is not born of God :—whatever may have been the case with him before, while he is living in the deliberate and habitual practice of sin, he is not,—he cannot be in a regenerate state. That the words must be understood with this limitation, is evident : because, if they be interpreted as including all sin, even sins of infirmity, they would sanction the methodistical notion of sinless perfection, and would be inconsistent with the declaration of the same Apostle, that,—*if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.*

We may remark that both in the world of nature and of grace there is an invariable connexion between cause and effect, which has been established by that great and glorious Being, whose unerring wisdom and unlimited power are displayed alike in the physical and in the moral system of the universe. It is the business of the philosopher and the man of science to investigate the former : it is the office of the minister of the gospel to explain and to elucidate the latter. To enable

* See Appendix x.

him to do this with success, he will often discover certain analogies between the two systems adduced by the inspired writers. He will indeed perceive that the tropical and parabolical language of scripture is usually founded upon such analogies. He will find that his Divine Master distinctly specifies some instances of such similitudes. It is upon this principle that our Blessed Lord puts the question,—*Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?*—*Even so, every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them.* From these words we may infer that there will be the same connexion in the spiritual world between the principle of grace implanted in the soul, and the outward manifestation of it exhibited by a holy life; that there is in the physical world, between the good qualities of the tree and the excellence of the fruit which it produces. So that, exactly for the same reason that a good tree cannot, by the laws which the Supreme Creator has prescribed to the operations of nature, bring forth evil fruit; he that is born of God cannot commit sin. Amongst trees, indeed, the general quality of which is good, some will bring forth fruit in greater abundance, and in greater perfection, than others; just in the same manner as, of those who receive the good seed into an honest and good heart, some yield thirty—some sixty—and some an hundred fold. Still, however, as the good seed cannot, by the immutable laws of the creation,

produce tares ; and as the good tree cannot, for the same cause, bear corrupt fruit, so the regenerate Christian cannot live in the practice of gross, wilful, and habitual sin. He has been convinced of the evil of sin by the enlightening influences of the Holy Spirit ; and, therefore, he hates it : and he has been delivered from the dominion of sin by his sanctifying and renewing grace ; and, therefore, he no longer yields his *members servants to uncleanness and to iniquity unto iniquity. For the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made him free from the law of sin and death.*

But, on the other hand, what shall be predicated of those who are living in a course of systematic violation of their baptismal covenant ? Are they made *free from the law of sin and death*, while they are *fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind* ? Are they walking in the Spirit, when they are exhibiting none of the graces of the Spirit ? It is manifest that such persons, continuing habitually in that state, either have never been the subjects of the regenerating agency of the Holy Spirit ; or, if they have, they have resisted it,—quenched it,—done despite to it.—I fear, my Reverend Brethren, that if we take an accurate survey of our respective flocks, we shall find characters of this description very numerous,—so numerous, indeed, as painfully to verify the declaration of our Blessed Lord, that *many are called, but few are chosen* ; and that, *nide is the gate, and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat.* Are we, then, to regard the condition of such persons as hope-

less and irremediable? Are we to leave them to perish in the evil courses which they have chosen? Is it in vain to urge them to turn their footsteps from the broad and beaten path, to the narrow and unfrequented one—to exchange the carnal for the spiritual mind—to put off the old man and to put on the new?—I trust that *we have not so learned Christ*. I trust that, as in those simple elements of Christian instruction which we impart to the little ones of our flocks through the medium of our Church Catechism, we teach them to believe not only in the Lord Jesus Christ as the Author of their redemption, but also in the Holy Ghost as the Author of their sanctification; so, likewise, in our labours for the conversion of adults, who have unhappily not continued in that state of salvation to which they had been called, we instruct them not only where to look for pardon, but also where to look for holiness. It would, indeed, be in vain to exhort them to effect this great change—this moral renovation—this passing from death unto life—this new creation, by any power which they possess inherently and independently in themselves; for the *preparations of the heart are from the Lord*; and it is from him that “all holy desires, all good counsels, and all just works do proceed.” But what they cannot do for themselves, the Holy Spirit both can and will do for them, if they “call for his special grace by diligent prayer.” To encourage them thus to call, our blessed Lord has furnished them with a most beautiful and touching illustration in order to evince the readiness of their heavenly Father to communicate the bless-

ing of which they stand in need. *If a son shall ask bread of any of you that is a Father, will he give him a stone? Or, if he ask a fish, will he for a fish give him a serpent? Or, if he ask an egg, will he offer him a scorpion?—If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?*—And for what purposes will he bestow this inestimable gift? Doubtless for such as are of most importance to those who by inattention or indifference to the truths of religion have darkened their understandings, and by vicious indulgence have strengthened the sinful propensities of their corrupt nature—the purposes of illumination and sanctification.

Let it, moreover, be constantly borne in mind that there is a strict union and harmony subsisting between all the great doctrines of the gospel, and that the salvation, which it offers to the fallen children of Adam, is a complete salvation. It provides no less for future holiness of life, than for the remission of sins that are past. In this amazing scheme of love and mercy, so admirably adapted to the wants of sinners, the Lord Jesus Christ is made to all those who believe in him, *wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption.* The light of saving knowledge, the gift of pardon, the grace of holiness, and the consummation of the whole, in the final salvation of the living members of his mystical body, are all the purchase of his merits, and the fruits of his intercession. Where, through the gracious influences of the Holy Spirit, one of these inestimable

privileges is conferred ; they will all be conferred. Those persons, whose sins have been pardoned by faith in the atoning blood of the Redeemer, must first have been convinced, by the agency of the Holy Spirit, of the malignity, turpitude, and ruinous consequences of sin,—under that conviction they must have been led to mourn over it, to confess it, and to forsake it ;—and the next step in the work of regeneration must have been to bring forth fruits meet for repentance. If any link in this chain be wanting, there can be no justifying faith,—no work of grace,—no genuine repentance : *for if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature : old things are passed away ; behold all things are become new.**

Hence also we are enabled to perceive the indissoluble connexion which subsists between a justifying faith and good works, and to conclude upon sure grounds that the latter “do spring out necessarily of a true and lively faith ; insomuch that by them a lively faith may be as evidently known as a tree discerned by the fruit.”† But this true and lively faith is not the product of man’s own unassisted reason. What are the words of our Blessed Lord ? *No man can come to me except the Father which hath sent me draw him.* What are the words of St. Paul ?—*By grace are ye saved through faith ; and that not of yourselves : it is the gift of God : not of works, lest any man should boast.‡* But, then, it is immediately subjoined, *For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them.*

* See Appendix xi.

† Article xii.

‡ See Appendix xii.

From these passages of scripture, and others of a similar import, we are led to infer that, whenever the Holy Spirit enables a man to believe with the heart unto righteousness, and with the mouth to make confession unto salvation, he contemporaneously implants a new principle of love and holy obedience, which becomes within him *a well of water springing up into everlasting life*.

Upon these vital and essential points, it is my deliberate conviction that the views so assiduously propagated by the writers of the Oxford Tracts and their partisans, are at variance with the teaching of the Reformers, as it is embodied in the liturgy, articles, and homilies of our Church, and, consequently, irreconcilable with scripture. They have, no doubt, arrived at an opposite conclusion. There is not upon earth an infallible tribunal authorised and empowered to adjudicate the question, and to pronounce on which side the truth preponderates. A time, however, is approaching, when it will be decided with unerring certainty which scheme of doctrine has had the greatest tendency to promote a legal, formal, pharisaical system of religion: and which has most contributed to uphold the purity of Christian faith and practice—to exhibit the manifold excellencies of our Church,—and to advance the glory of God and the happiness of man, in the conversion of sinners from the error of their ways.

Much as I am disposed to withhold my assent from some of the doctrines propounded by the writers of the Oxford Tracts, I am equally inclined to repudiate their interpretation of prophecy, as it is exemplified in the

eighty-third Tract, which contains a course of sermons on Antichrist. Time, however, will not permit me to enter into any details upon this subject. I will only briefly observe that the writer professes to “follow the exclusive guidance of the ancient Fathers of the Church,”* thinking that they are in some respects more likely to be right than commentators of the present day†—that he is of opinion that the three years and a half of Antichrist’s tyranny are to be taken literally,‡—that Antichrist is an individual,§, will probably be a Jew,|| sit in the temple of Jerusalem,¶ and resuscitate the kingdom of the Jews,**—that there is still in the city of Rome a Christian Church “sanctifying it, interceding for it, saving it,”—and that with regard to the fulfilment of the prophecy concerning Rome which is yet future, “perchance, through God’s mercy, it may be procrastinated even to the end, and never be fulfilled.”†† The foregoing specimens will suffice to shew the degree of credit to which these writers are entitled as interpreters of prophecy.

Although I have already trespassed so long upon your time and patience, I must crave a little further indulgence, while I make a few brief remarks on two subjects of peculiar interest at the present moment. The subjects to which I allude are the twin measures (if I may be permitted so to designate them) of National Education and Church Extension. Of these measures, it may be truly affirmed that each, if carried into effect

* p. 1. † p. 3. ‡ p. 4. § p. 8. || p. 18. ¶ p. 19.
 ** p. 19. †† p. 37. See Appendix xiii.

upon an enlarged and comprehensive scale, would reciprocally augment the necessity of the other,—
“alterius sic altera poscit opem res et conjurat amice.”

With regard to the first, it would be superfluous in me to take a review of the plans which have been adopted, on one side, for its advancement; or of the efforts which have been made, on another, to wrest its management out of the hands of those to whom its superintendence legitimately and exclusively pertains. You are likewise well aware that in some quarters it has been attempted, in the true spirit of the scepticism of the day, to dissociate secular knowledge altogether from religious instruction; and that in others, similar exertions have been employed to merge all the peculiar and life-giving doctrines of Christianity in a generalized system of education, which may be equally acceptable to the Socinian, the Romanist, and the liberal Dissenter. Against the adoption of such ungodly and unscriptural schemes, we, my Reverend Brethren, have already protested: and I trust that we shall always continue, with the blessing of God, successfully to protest. We can never, indeed, acquiesce in any measure, however specious or however seemingly advantageous, which interferes with the discipline of the Church, or trenches upon its independence. We shall thankfully accept the liberality of the state in aid of our endeavours to train up the rising generation in the principles of true religion and pure morality, and to promote their advancement in such secular knowledge as may be best adapted to their relative position in the scale of society.

But we cannot accept it, if it be clogged with conditions which are incompatible with the spiritual functions of our Ecclesiastical Superiors, or with the fundamental principle which is assumed by the Church of England as the sole basis on which she wishes her members to be brought up, viz : *in the nurture and admonition of the Lord*. I am confident that I am speaking your sentiments no less than my own, when I affirm that we utterly disclaim all ideas of coercion or compulsion. We would leave to parents and guardians the free and unfettered choice of the system of education which they may prefer for those who are too young to choose for themselves. But we do think, and we ever shall think, that the state is bound by every principle of religious obligation, as well as of sound policy, to furnish us with the means of offering to all indiscriminately, who are in any degree dependent upon eleemosynary aid for their education, those instructions in the doctrines and duties of our holy religion, and that portion of secular knowledge which we are conscientiously persuaded may be most conducive to their temporal and eternal welfare ; and we are further of opinion that the administration of any funds that may be so provided, should be placed under the controul of the bishops of our church, and that they alone should be responsible for the useful and efficient application of such funds.

If the enduring realities of a future and eternal world be of infinitely more importance than any temporal interests ; and if all that is most great, or most valuable, or most admired upon earth fades into nothing in com-

parison of the value of those never dying souls, for which the adorable Son of God shed his precious blood upon the cross—then the subject of Church Extension is one of the most important that can occupy the attention of the conscientious and enlightened statesman. As the discussion of it in one branch of the legislature has been postponed, it remains yet to be seen how our legislators will deal with the question. For my own part, I grieve to say that I do not anticipate such a result as would be gratifying to the feelings and accordant with the wishes of every sincere Christian who has the best interests of his fellow creatures warmly at heart, and who duly appreciates the excellence of those institutions, both civil and ecclesiastical, under which it is his happiness to live.

Innovations of a recent date have conferred upon the Dissenters an influence in the legislature of which they have not been slow to avail themselves, to the serious detriment and disadvantage of the Established Church. This influence has been called into operation upon the present occasion to a great and fearful extent. How far it has been successfully exerted will soon be ascertained. In the mean-time, I cannot forbear expressing my decided opinion that it has never been more reprehensibly or more disgracefully employed than in this instance. To be instrumental in withholding the bread of life from famishing myriads, when the church seeks the means of imparting it,—to throw obstacles in the way of those who are desirous of carrying the light of the Gospel into the midst of the dense masses of our

population, who are now sitting *in darkness and the shadow of death*—to impede the moral, religious, and social improvement of multitudes who, though living in a Christian land, know nothing of Christianity but the name,—such a course as this, involves, as it appears to me, a degree of guilt, which it is perfectly appalling to contemplate. Nothing can possibly justify such a procedure; but the most conclusive and satisfactory evidence that the voluntary system, with all the multifarious sects, holding the most discordant and jarring sentiments which have emanated from it, is more in accordance with the word of God, than that of our pure and apostolical Church; and that this system contains within itself resources fully adequate to supply the spiritual exigences of the populous manufacturing districts. Which of these suppositions is farthest removed from the truth, it would be difficult to determine. It is at least evident that, so far as many of the Dissenters are concerned, Infidelity may extend its ravages, Socialism may spread its foul abominations, and Popery may propagate with increasing success its soul-destroying errors and debasing superstitions, provided the Dissenting interest be not weakened by the appropriation of some part of the national revenue to the extension of the national Church.

Be it ours, my Reverend Brethren, to pursue a widely different course. Let us, by every method that the forms of the constitution will authorise, and above all, which the precepts of Christianity will sanction, endeavour to awaken the Government and the Legislature

to a sense of their duties and responsibilities. Let no present repulses dishearten, or fear of popular clamour deter us from the adoption of such measures as we are convinced in our consciences may be most subservient to the great ends of diffusing the blessings of a sound religious education amongst the rising generation, and dispensing the word and sacraments to those who are yet destitute of these privileges. Sensible of the momentous nature of that struggle in which we are engaged, and conscious of the multiplied difficulties with which we are encompassed in these *perilous times*, may we always be actuated by the purest motives, *give no offence in anything that the ministry be not blamed*,—be influenced, not by *the spirit of fear* ; but of *power, and of love, and of a sound mind*,—and, *in nothing terrified with our adversaries*, may we, with a firm and undaunted resolution, consign our cause into the hands of that gracious God, who has said,—*Commit thy way unto the Lord ; trust also in him ; and he shall bring it to pass : and he shall bring forth thy righteousness as the light, and thy judgment as the noonday : rest in the Lord, and wait patiently for him ; fret not thyself because of him who prospereth in his way, because of the man who bringeth wicked devices to pass !*

APPENDIX.

No. 1.

INDEPENDENTLY of the disparaging terms in which the members of the new School of Oxford Divines have frequently spoken of the Reformers, and of those who, in past or in present times, have been strenuously opposed to the corruptions of the Church of Rome,—independently also, of the extraordinary terms which they have often employed with reference to that apostate Church—no one, who is conversant with their writings, can refrain from thinking that many of the opinions which they have promulgated with regard to the fundamental doctrine of justification,—the rule of faith,—and the Sacrament of the Lord's supper, are more in accordance with Popery, than with the Protestantism of the Church of England. It can, therefore, occasion no surprise that they should endeavour to excite a prejudice against their adversaries by stigmatising them with the designation of “ultra-Protestants.” As they themselves fall so much below the legitimate standard of Protestantism, it is natural that they should represent their antagonists (in the number of whom I shall always consider it a privilege to enrol myself) as holding extreme opinions. But it was not to have been anticipated that two of the most eminent mystagogues of this school (the Editors of Froude's Remains) should have so far identified themselves with the Papal Apostasy as to have taken up a position diametrically opposed, according to their own confession, to that of the Reformers. It was not to have

been expected that they should avowedly have espoused some of the most unsound and objectionable opinions of the Ancient Fathers—opinions which by being perverted and pushed further than their original authors intended, have constituted the basis of that enormous superstructure of fraud, imposture, superstition, and impiety, which is destined at some future, and probably no distant, period, to experience a signal overthrow.

In a subsequent part of the preface, from which I have made that extract in my Charge to which allusion is here made, the Editors of "the Remains" ask—whether, because Bishop Jewel, in his defence of the "Apology of the Church of England" against the Jesuit Harding, has not spoken of the apostolical succession in terms which harmonize with their ideas,—whether, if this treatise be regarded as an official exponent of the views of the Reformers, this would not be "a strong fact to justify any dislike or suspicion which might be felt of that party generally?"—And they further enquire whether "it would not be rightly done for a Churchman to decline their authority as a theological school, and be careful how he symbolized with them in the use of theological words?"—Preface to the second part of the Remains of R. H. Froude, p. xxix. Now, such language as this would be in perfect keeping from the pen of a Romanist, who may naturally be supposed to view the Reformation, and its authors and promoters, with "dislike and suspicion." But how Ministers of the Church of England can feel themselves justified in declining the authority of "a Theological School," by which the Homilies were set forth, and the Articles and Liturgy were compiled, it is somewhat difficult to conceive.

As the following article of the Appendix will be devoted to Mr. Froude's Remains, I shall not lay before the reader any extracts from them in this number, or make any observations at present upon the sentiments which he entertained relative to Popery on the one hand, or the Reformation on the other. Whatever they were, it will be seen from the extracts which will be given from

the preface to the first part of "the Remains," compared with that I have quoted from the preface to the second, that the Editors have identified themselves with his opinions.

Since, however, the British Critic is generally supposed to be the organ of the writers of the Oxford Tracts, I will in this article present the reader with some passages taken from that periodical, which, when connected with what has been brought forward, both in my last Charge and in the present, will enable him to judge whether the Romanists have not some reason for hailing these Divines as befriending their cause.

In No. xl. p. 393, of the British Critic, the Reviewer, speaking of Dr. Wiseman, says that "he argues from the structure of the Bible, and the circumstances under which it comes to us, that it was not intended to be the instrument of teaching individuals the Christian doctrine. It is common for ultra-Protestants to argue on the other hand, that a written record must be the sole instrument of revealed teaching, because oral tradition is in its nature vague and uncertain."—The obvious inference to be deduced from this passage is, that the Reviewer fully coincides in opinion with Dr. Wiseman, and that, according to his judgment, it is one of the errors of ultra-Protestantism, to imagine that "revealed teaching" is limited to the Bible, and does not include "oral tradition."—What can Dr. Wiseman, or any other Romanist wish for more?

In the same number, at p. 400, the Reviewer observes, with reference to the same individual,—“Such are some of the exceptions, which Dr. Wiseman takes to the Protestant Missions. When he turns to the Roman Catholic, he is perhaps less to be trusted, it being easier to be candid to an opponent whom we do not fear, than impartial in our own case. If we are to take his account as it stands, Romanism has a success among the heathen, inferior indeed, but similar to that which attended the preaching of the first propagators of the gospel. Nor are we unwilling to allow, that it has so much of the blessing of the true

Church with it, as to have a measure of success, which ultra-Protestant efforts, however zealous and praiseworthy in themselves, will not experience."

Here it is plainly implied that Dr. Wiseman is warranted in feeling such a confidence in the goodness of his cause, as may enable him to divest himself of any fear of his opponents. With regard to the boasted success of Popish Missions, the question is, what criterion the Reviewer would adopt, whereby to estimate the extent of that success. From his readiness to allow a larger measure to the Romanists, than to those whom he opprobriously terms ultra-Protestants, either relative numbers must constitute his standard, or he must think that the former make their converts better Christians than the latter. If they, indeed, obtain a numerical superiority, it will admit of an easy solution. To induce men to exchange one debasing system of superstition for another, or the idolatry of Heathenism for the idolatry of Popery, is probably no very arduous task. But to turn men wholly *from idols to serve the living and true God*,—to teach them to *worship him in spirit and in truth*,—to lead them to embrace the gospel of Christ in its purity and spirituality,—and to induce them to live in a manner conformably to it's holy precepts,—“*hic labor, hoc opus est!*”

Viewing the Church of Rome in the light in which the Reviewer does, as “the true Church,” there is no wonder that he should not be unwilling to concede that a blessing rests upon its missionary exertions. Whether its converts be more or fewer in number than those of ultra-Protestants, in consistency with his own views, it is natural that he should regard the former as superior to the latter in all the ingredients of the Christian character. But that the Reformers contemplated the Church of Rome in a widely different light, is apparent not only from their writings in general, but especially from the following passage which occurs in the Homily for Whitsunday. “But now herein standeth the controversy, whether all men do justly arrogate to themselves the

Holy Ghost, or no ? The Bishops of Rome have for a long time made a sore challenge thereunto, reasoning with themselves after this sort,—‘The Holy Ghost,’ say they, ‘was promised to the Church, and never forsaketh the Church. But we are the chief heads and the principal part of the Church, therefore we have the Holy Ghost for ever ; and whatsoever we decree are undoubted verities, and oracles of the Holy Ghost.’ That ye may perceive the weakness of this argument, it is needful to teach you, first, what the true Church of Christ is, and then to confer the Church of Rome therewith to discern how well they agree together. The true Church is an universal congregation or fellowship of God’s faithful and elect people, built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the head corner-stone. And it hath always three notes or marks, whereby it is known : pure and sound doctrine, the sacraments administered according to Christ’s holy institution, and the right use of ecclesiastical discipline. This description of the Church is agreeable both to the Scriptures of God, and also to the doctrine of the ancient Fathers, so that none may justly find fault therewith. Now, if you will compare this with the Church of Rome, not as it was in the beginning, but as it is at present, and hath been for the space of nine hundred years and odd ; you shall well perceive the state thereof to be so far wide from the nature of the true Church, as nothing can be more. For neither are they built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, retaining the sound and pure doctrine of Christ Jesus ; neither yet do they order the sacraments, or else the ecclesiastical keys, in such sort as he did first institute and ordain them : but have so intermingled their own traditions and inventions, by chopping and changing, by adding and plucking away, that now they may seem to be converted into a new guise.

Christ commended to his Church a sacrament of his body and blood : they have changed it into a sacrifice for the quick and the dead. Christ did minister to his Apostles, and the Apostles to other men indifferently under both kinds : they have robbed the

lay-people of the cup, saying, that for them one kind is sufficient. Christ ordained no other element to be used in baptism, but only water, whereunto when the word is joined, it is made, as St. Augustine saith, a full and perfect sacrament. They being wiser in their own conceit than Christ, think it is not well or orderly done, unless they use conjuration, unless they hallow the water, unless there be oil, salt, spittle, tapers, and such other dumb ceremonies, serving to no use, contrary to the plain rule of St. Paul, who willeth all things to be done in the Church to edification. Christ ordained the authority of the keys to excommunicate notorious sinners, and to absolve them which are truly penitent : they abuse this power at their own pleasure, as well in cursing the godly with bell, book, and candle, as also in absolving the reprobate, which are known to be unworthy of any Christian society : whereof they that lust to see examples, let them search their lives. To be short, look what our Saviour Christ pronounced of the Scribes and Pharisees in the gospel : the same may be boldly and with safe conscience pronounced of the Bishops of Rome ; namely, that they have forsaken, and daily do forsake, the commandments of God, to erect and set up their own constitutions. Which thing being true, as all they which have any light of God's word must needs confess, we may well conclude, according to the rule of Augustine, that the Bishops of Rome and their adherents, are not the true Church of Christ, much less then to be taken as chief heads and rulers of the same."—Homilies, 8vo. edition, p. 393.

If the Church of Rome be "the true Church," she can of course be neither Antichristian nor apostate. Accordingly a writer in the *British Critic* of last January (No. liii. p. 53.) denies by implication her being either one or the other. He thus argues upon the question of separation from the Church of Rome :—"If indeed we considered that the Pope was Antichrist, and had denied the foundation of the faith, then indeed our keeping aloof would justify itself. If Rome is apostate, she has no longer claims on us as a Church ; but while she is allowed to be a Church, she has claims.

In this point of view it is, that the ultra-Protestant theory, which sacrifices the Scripture promises made to the Church, becomes thereby much simpler than our own. It denies that the Church of Rome exists, and so gets rid of the question why we are estranged from it; and this is why the theory, that Rome is the Church of Antichrist, was so popular at the time of the Reformation. It made short work with a number of questions, which else had been perplexing."

Assuredly the Church of Rome must feel deeply indebted for the kind interposition of her friends, who would rescue her from the obloquy of meriting the charge of being an Antichristian and an apostate Church. If this charge have no foundation, then the warning voice in the Apocalypse (xviii. 4.) is not applicable to the members of her communion. This, indeed, is a necessary consequence, which is boldly avowed by the Rev. W. Palmer, in his "Supplement to the Treatise on the Church." (p. xx.) After citing some prophecies of Ezekiel, &c., he observes that "whoever compares these and the other connected predictions concerning Babylon, Nineveh, and Tyre, with those of the xvii. and xviii. chapters of the Apocalypse, can (I think) scarcely avoid the admission that the latter *may* refer only to Heathen Rome. Supposing, however, that they refer also to Papal Rome, still it seems a most unreasonable and strained interpretation to extend the condemnation to **ALL THE CHURCHES SUBJECT TO ROME**, or to apply the exhortation of the angel to *come out* of that devoted city, (e. g. when the signs of its approaching destruction appear) to urge the necessity of forsaking the communion of these Churches. Such an interpretation is wholly gratuitous, perfectly uncalled for by the context, and contrary to all the principles of unity, laid down by the Word of God." When the danger annexed to a non-compliance with the warning is nothing less than a participation in the guilt of that community from which the people of God are commanded to secede, and in the plagues which are denounced upon that community, it is much to be regretted that the learned

writer has not, in a practical question of such extreme importance, specified the Churches to which he alludes. Does he refer to the Popish Church in Spain, or in Portugal, or in South America, or (to come nearer home) in Ireland? I always thought that Rome was considered by the Romanists as the centre of the unity of Christendom—that the uniformity of the rites, usages, doctrines, and discipline, of the Church of Rome, together with its assumed apostolical succession, and the supremacy of the Pope, as the universal Bishop, constituted its claims to Catholicity,—and that while its prerogative was infallibility, its boast was unchangeableness. All this is implied in the following questions which are put at the consecration of a Bishop, according to “The Order of the Latin Rite for the Ordination of Bishops in the Roman Catholic Church. Translated and published with the approbation of the Most Rev. and Right Rev. the Prelates of Ireland.—Cork, 1820.

“Q. Wilt thou reverently entertain, teach, and keep the traditions of the Orthodox Fathers, and the authoritative enactments of the Apostolical Chair?

“A. I will.

“Q. Wilt thou uniformly render to Peter, the blessed Apostle, to whom was given by God the power of binding and loosing, and to his Vicar Pius, the now Pope’s Holiness, and to his successors, being Bishops of Rome, faith, subjection, and obedience, according as the canons enjoin?

“A. I will.

* * * * *

“Q. Believest thou that the Holy, Catholic, and Apostolical Church is the one true Church, in which the one true baptism is given, and the true remission of all sins?

“A. I believe.

“Q. Moreover dost thou accurse every heresy which listeth itself up against this Holy Catholic Church?

“A. I accurse them all.”

Although it is not my intention in this article to enter into the questions of the apostacy or Antichristianism of the Church of Rome, I will, in this place, introduce to the reader's attention the manner in which Bishops Hurd, and Hallifax have noticed in their sermons preached at the Warburtonian Lecture, what the Reviewer terms the popular theory of applying the designation of Antichrist to the See of Rome. This Lecture, be it observed, was founded by Bishop Warburton, according to the terms of the Deed of Trust, for the express purpose of proving "the truth of revealed religion in general, and of the Christian in particular, from the completion of the prophecies in the Old and New Testament, which relate to the Christian Church, especially TO THE APOSTACY OF PAPAL ROME."

"It is well known," says Bishop Hurd, "that, when the Reformation was set on foot in the sixteenth century, this great work was every where justified and conducted on the general principle, 'That the Pope, or at least the Church of Rome, was Antichrist.'

"Now men of sense, who have looked no farther into the subject, and yet remember, as they easily may, the bitterness, the policy, the fraud, too commonly observable in the conduct of religious (as of other) parties, easily fall into the suspicion, that this cry of Antichrist was only an artifice of the time, or at least an extravagance of it; when the minds of men were intensely heated against each other, and when of course no arms would be refused, that might serve to annoy or distress the enemy.

"In these circumstances, it was natural enough, it will be said, for angry men to *see* that in the prophecies which was not contained in them; or for designing men to *feign* that which they did not see; in order the more effectually to carry on the cause in which they had embarked, and to seduce the unwary multitude into their quarrel. In short, the passions of the Reformed, it is readily presumed, had some way or other conjured up this spectre of Antichrist, as a convenient engine by which they might

either gratify their own spleen, or excite that of the people; the prophecies all the while being no further concerned in the question, than as they were wrested for these purposes (as they frequently have been, in like cases) from their true and proper meaning.

“To remove this capital prejudice (which, more than any other, hath, perhaps, diverted serious men from giving a due attention to this argument) was the main purpose of the preceding discourse; in which it was clearly shewn from historical testimony, that the question concerning Antichrist had its rise in the earliest times; that the prophecies concerning Antichrist, though imperfectly enough understood, and, it may be, passionately applied, had yet, been considered, very generally, as referring to *some* corrupt Christian and even ecclesiastical person or power; and that many eminent members of the Christian Church had even applied those prophecies to the *same* person or power, to which Protestants now apply them, and for the *same* end, which Protestants have in view, when they apply them to such person or power, for many successive centuries, before the Reformation began. From all which it is undeniable, that the Reformers did not innovate in the interpretation of the prophecies concerning Antichrist; and that their application of them to the see of Rome, was not a contrivance, which sprung out of the passionate resentments, or interested policies of that time.

“It is true indeed (for the truth should not, and needs not be concealed) that the Reformers were forward enough to lay hold on this received sense of the prophecies, and to make their utmost advantage of it; the account of which matter is, briefly, this: The Christian Church had now for many ages been held together in a close dependence on the chair of St. Peter; and to secure and perpetuate that dependence, was the principal object and concern of the Papal Court. Various means were employed for this purpose: but the most effectual was thought to be, to inculcate in the strongest terms on the minds of Christians the abso-

lute necessity of communicating with the Bishop of Rome, as the centre of unity, and, by divine appointment, the supreme visible head of the Christian world. Hence, to renounce in any degree the authority and jurisdiction of Rome, was deemed the most in-expiable of all sins. The name of SCHISM was fastened upon it; a name, which sounded higher than that of Heresy itself, as implying in it the accumulated guilt of Apostacy, and Infidelity. The way of heaven was shut against all offenders of this sort; and, to make their condition as miserable, as it was hopeless, all the engines of persecution, such as racks, fires, gibbets, inquisitions, and even Crusades had been employed against them: as was seen in the case of the Albigenses and others, who, at different times had attempted to withdraw themselves from the papal dominion.

“Such was the state of things, when the bold spirit of Luther resolved, at all adventures, to break through this inveterate servitude,* so dextrously imposed on the Christian world, under the pretence, and in the name, of ecclesiastical union. Yet the peril of the attempt was easily foreseen, or was presently felt. And, therefore, the Reformers (to prevent the ill effects which the dreadful name of *Schism* might have on themselves and their cause, and to satisfy at once their own consciences and those of their adherents) not only revived and enforced the old charge of *Antichristianism* against the Church of Rome; but further insisted (on the authority of those prophecies which justified the charge) that Christians were bound in conscience, by the most express command, to break all communion with her. The expedient, one sees, was well calculated to serve the purpose in hand: but still the command was truly and pertinently alleged; for it exists in so many words (however the blindness or the bigotry of former times had overlooked it) in the book of the *Revela-*

* Rompons leurs liens, dit il, et dejettons leur joug de dessus nos têtes.—
Bossuet, H. V. l. i. c. 26.

tions.* So that whoever admitted the *charge* itself to be well founded, could not reject this *consequence* of it, That Christ and Antichrist had no fellowship with each other. And on this popular ground, chiefly, the Protestant cause, in those early times, was upheld; with no small advantage to the patrons of it; it being now clear, that the invidious imputation of Schism had lost its malignity in the general obligation, which lay upon Christians, to renounce all communion with the Church of Rome.

"This being the true account of that zeal, with which the doctrine of Antichrist was asserted in the days of Reformation, let us see how the case stands at present; and whether any reasonable prejudice lies against the doctrine itself, from the uses, that were then so happily made of it.

"In the first place, the injunction, *to come out of her*, was, as I observed, not forged by the Reformers; nor (admitting that Church to be Antichristian) was it misrepresented by them. Every reader of the prophecies must confess, that the command is early delivered, and that the sense of it is not mistaken. How serviceable soever, therefore, this topic was to the cause of reformation, it is not, on that account, to be the less esteemed by the just and candid inquirer.

"In the next place, I will freely admit, that the dread, in which most men, if not all men,† of that time, were held, of in-

* Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues.—Rev. xviii. 4.

† Il (Luther) condamnoit les Bohémiens qui s'étoient separez de nôtre communion, et potestoit qu'il ne lui arriveroit jamais de tomber dans un semblable Schisme.—Bossuet, Hist. des Variat. l. i. p. 21. Par. 1740. And again, p. 28; Apres, dit il (Luther), que j'eus surmonté tous les argumens qu'on proposoit, il en restoit un dernier qu'à peine je pus surmonter par le secours de Jesus Christ avec une extrême difficulté and beaucoup d'angoisse; *ce'st qu'il falloît écouter l'Eglise*.—One sees for what purpose M. Bossuet quotes these passages, and others of the same kind, from the writings of Luther. However, they shew very clearly how deep an impression the idea of Schism had made on the mind even of this intrepid Reformer.

curing the imputation of Schism, was much greater, than the occasion required, and, upon the whole, a sort of panic terror. For, though a causeless separation from the Church would indeed have loaded the Reformers with much and real guilt, yet when the abuses of it had risen to that height as to reduce an honest man to the alternative, either of committing sin, or of leaving its communion, they might well have justified themselves on the evident necessity of the thing, and had no need of a positive command to authorize their separation. All this is, now, clearly seen; and if the first Reformers did not see thus much (as very probably they did not) all that follows, is, that the doctrine of Antichrist, from which that command derived its effect, was less necessary to their cause, than they supposed it to be; not, that the doctrine itself is without authority, or the command without obligation.

“ Lastly, I observe, that, though the *violences* of the time might force the Reformers to take shelter in this doctrine of Antichrist, and though the *prejudices* of the time might induce them to take the advantage, they did, of it; yet, neither of these considerations affords any just presumption against the doctrine, as it lies in scripture, and is enforced by us at this time out of it; because we argue not from their authority, but from the prophecies themselves; which are much better understood by us, than they were by them; and are still maintained to speak the sense, which they put upon them, I mean with respect to the general application of them to the Church of Rome, though we have nothing to apprehend either from the power of that Church, or from the prejudices of the people.

“ Let no man, therefore, rashly conclude, from the free use made of this doctrine by our old Reformers (and there is scarce one of them that has not left behind him a tract or discourse on Antichrist) that it hath no better or other foundation, than in their interests or passions. A reasonable man sees, that it has no dependence at all upon them. That Luther, indeed, heated in

the controversy with the Church of Rome, and smocking, as I may say, from the recent blast of the papal thunders, should cry out, ANTICHRIST,* shall pass, if you will, for a folly of rage and desperation.† But that we, at this day, who revolve the prophecies at our ease, and are in little more dread of modern Rome, than of ancient Babylon, should still find the resemblance so striking as to fall upon the same idea; and should even be driven against the strong bias of prejudice (which with us, in England, for above a century past, has drawn the other way) to adopt the language of our great Reformer; this, I say, is a consideration of another sort, and will not be put off so slightly.”—Bishop Hurd’s Warburtonian Lecture. Sermon. viii. p. 248—258.

Bishop Hallifax speaking of Luther, observes, that “when he found by a careful comparison of facts and prophecies, that the corruptions then actually existing in the Church of Rome were the very same with those declared in the inspired oracles;—and reflected also, that the warning voice which had proclaimed these delusions of Antichrist, had commanded the faithful people of God to renounce the society of this impostor:—the conclusion was unavoidable, that all persons, who were persuaded that Papal Rome was indeed concerned in the sacred predictions, had not only the choice in point of right, but were obliged, in point of duty, to separate themselves from a Church, whose communication was infectious, and in which they could no longer continue, without *partaking of its sins*.

“On this ground, then, that the Pope was Antichrist, the great secession of Protestants was begun; and on this ground the lawfulness of such a secession may be clearly shewn. For although to forsake the external communion of a Church, where there is no urgent necessity for such a procedure, be without excuse: yet,

* *Contra Bullam Antichristi*—a tract of Luther, so called, against the Bull of Leo X.

† Luther reconnoit après la rupture ouverte, que dans les commencemens il étoit comme au *désespoir*.—Bossuet, H. V. c. 26.

when a separation must either be made, or we must participate with others in matters which appear to us to be sinful, no reasonable man can have any scruples, as to the part he ought to take. Not every separation, then, from the Church, but a causeless separation only, is to be condemned: and the true reason why Protestants hold themselves bound to leave the society of Papists, is not so much because the latter are known to maintain errors in doctrine, and to have introduced corruptions in worship, which the former disavow; but because they impose these errors and corruptions upon others, and have so ordered the terms of Church fellowship, that we must join with them in these things, or in nothing. **THIS IT IS WHICH FIXES THE MARK OF ANTICHRIST ON THE CHURCH OF ROME**, and renders it unsafe for Christians of other denominations to unite with it in matters of religion. The imputation of schism, therefore, fall it where it will, lights not justly upon us: the danger and the punishment, annexed to such a crime, it becomes them more particularly to consider, who have made it impracticable for others to associate with them, by requiring unlawful conditions of communion.”—Bishop Hallifax’s Warburtonian Lecture. Sermon. xii. p. 369—371.

In the same article of the same number, at p. 79, the Reviewer observes:—“at all times, since Christianity came into the world, an open contest has been going on between religion and irreligion; and the true Church of course has ever been on the religious side. This then is a sure test in every age, *where* the Christian should stand. There may have been corruptions or errors, and great difficulties of judgment about details: but in spite of them all, he would feel no hesitation, did he live in the eleventh century, that Hildebrand was the champion of heaven, not Cæsar; in the twelfth, Becket, not Henry.” To the proposition contained in the first sentence of this quotation, every sincere Christian must instantly give his unqualified assent; because he knows, upon inspired authority, that, from the days of Ishmael and Isaac, as

then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even so it is now. But if he comes to apply this test to the Church of Rome, as its doings are recorded in history, from the eleventh century to the present time, as far as it has possessed the means and the opportunity, he must either reverse the declaration of the Apostle, or he must come to the conclusion that the Church of Rome is not "the true Church." That, however, it is so, in the judgment of the writers in the *British Critic*, is apparent, not only from an extract which is given in the beginning of this article, but also from the one last cited. If Hildebrand and Becket were "the champions of heaven," they were the assertors of the doctrines, and vindicators of the privileges of "the true Church:" and they may with great propriety be associated together in the same category: for had the latter ever been elevated to the papal chair, there is every reason to believe that he would have evinced the same arrogant, imperious, and intolerant spirit with the former. Let us, then, survey the character which competent judges have given us of this "champion of heaven,"—this maintainer of the rights of "the true Church,"—beginning with the homily from which I have already quoted. "What shall we say of him that made Henry, the emperor, with his wife and his young child, to stand at the gates of the city, in the rough winter, bare footed and bare legged, only clothed in linsey woolsey, eating nothing from morning to night, and that for the space of three days? Shall we say that he had God's Holy Spirit within him, and not rather the spirit of the devil? Such a tyrant was Pope Hildebrand, most worthy to be called a firebrand, if we shall term him as he hath best deserved."—*Homilies*, 8vo. edition, p. 397.

Again, how is the same individual characterized by Bishop Newton and by Mosheim? The former observes (vol. iii., p. 162.)—"The papal power was in this century (viz. xi.) carried beyond all bounds by the reigning Popes, and particularly the violence and haughtiness of Gregory VII., whose former name was Hildebrand, or Hell-brand, as he hath often been denominated." The

latter, speaking of the same Pope, (vol. ii., p. 274.) says that "void of all principle, and destitute of every pious and virtuous feeling, he suffered little restraint in his audacious pursuits, from the dictates of religion, or the remonstrances of conscience."

Bishop Hallifax's character of Hildebrand I shall introduce to the reader's attention with a longer quotation ; because it exhibits a vivid picture of the conduct of the Popes at the period, to which it refers. "Not content with the advantages so fraudulently obtained, over their brethren of the hierarchy, they asserted next that, as visible heads of the Church, their authority was superior to that of all synods and councils, whether provincial or general ; none of which, it was pretended, could legally be convened, but by their permission ; and whose determinations were of no validity, unless enforced and ratified by their sentence. It was an easy step after this to proceed to whatever higher degrees of arrogance they pleased ; to assume the disposal of ecclesiastical offices and honours of every kind ; to demand an exemption, for themselves, and for all the orders of the Clergy, from secular justice ; to promote appeals to their own courts ; to exalt their own decisions and those of the canons, above the injunctions of Scripture ; and, in a word, to act in all respects as divinely-appointed Monarchs of the Church of Christ. Nothing remained to render the system of tyranny complete, but to exert the same transcendent prerogative over princes and sovereigns, as they already exercised over the Bishops and Clergy ; from the ceremony permitted to them of crowning, to infer the right of making kings, of absolving subjects from their allegiance, of trying, condemning, and dethroning refractory monarchs. Nor was it long before the ill-judged munificence of the emperors, on whom till now they had been dependent, enabled them to reach this sublimest pinnacle of priestly pride, and, in consequence of a power derived to them from Jesus Christ, to degrade to the lowest acts of humiliation, to excommunicate, and to depose their benefactors. THE EXECUTION OF THIS LAST IMPIETY WAS KEPT FOR THE TIMES

OF THE PROFLIGATE HILDEBRAND, BETTER KNOWN BY THE NAME OF GREGORY VII; WHOSE POLITICAL DISCERNMENT AND INTREPID TEMPER, UNCHECKED BY ANY RESTRAINTS FROM MORAL PRINCIPLES, QUALIFIED HIM IN AN EMINENT MANNER TO ADVANCE THE PAPAL SUPREMACY TO ITS GREATEST HEIGHT.”—Bishop Hallifax’s Warburtonian Lecture. Sermon xi., p. 338—340.

The reader is now, I trust, enabled fully to appreciate the sentiments entertained by the writers in the *British Critic*, relative to the Church of Rome and one of its most devoted champions. At the same time, he will naturally be led to anticipate that if there be any consistency in their views, its most vigorous adversaries, and even the victims of its most cruel and unrelenting persecutions, must attract but little of their sympathy or admiration. This anticipation will be fully verified.

With regard to the most zealous opponents of Romanism in the present day, they are uniformly denounced by these writers as “ultra-Protestants.” With regard to those who in former times protested against the errors and corruptions of the Church of Rome, or those who, in imitation of the primitive martyrs, suffered their blood to be spilled on the ground like water rather than *be partakers of her sins* by conforming to her idolatrous practices, and adopting her unscriptural tenets; the following specimens will afford incontestable evidence of their bias. Speaking of Wickliffe in No. XLIX., p. 3., they say:—“We think him quite an instance of a man who had respectable and even laudable objects in view to begin with; but who pursued them in a proud, audacious,” (the very epithet applied above by Mosheim to Hildebrand!) “unscrupulous, and self-seeking way; to the entire lowering at last of his own views and principles.” In the same number at p. 114., they observe, with respect to the Lollards:—“On the whole, whether we look to the character, or to the doctrines and opinions of the Lollards, they seem to have little claim to be con-

sidered in any other light than as the dissenters of the day ;" and, again, at p. 123. :—"Certain religious parties always have been attached to the military method of carrying on things. The Paulicians were fighters ; so were the Albigenes ; so were, as we see, the Lollards ; so were the Puritans."

For a satisfactory refutation of the calumnies brought by Popish writers against the Paulicians, Vallenses or Waldenses, and Albigenes, the reader may consult, with pleasure and advantage, the Rev. G. S. Faber's valuable and learned work entitled, "An Inquiry into the History and Theology of the Ancient Vallenses and Albigenes ; as exhibiting agreeably to the promises, the perpetuity of the sincere Church of Christ." But as Wickliffe, and the Lollards, and Albigenes, are mentioned by M. Rodolphe Peyrani, whom Mr. Gilly styles "the venerable moderator or primate of the ancient Church of the Waldenses," in an interview which they had together, I will here present the reader with an extract from the "Narrative of an Excursion to the Mountains of Piemont," p. 78., which will shew that this exemplary Pastor speaks of them in a manner very different from the British Critic. "I cannot forget," says the author of this interesting narrative, "nor must I omit to notice, the evident satisfaction M. Peyrani felt in explaining how closely the doctrines of the Vaudois Church assimilated to those of the Church of England. He pointed to the works of Tillotson, Barrow, and Taylor, which still enriched his book-case, and declared that every time he read them, he was more and more gratified by the light which these English Divines had thrown upon truths, for their adherence to which his poor brethren had been so often obliged to conceal themselves in their mountain fastnesses. 'But remember,' said the old man, with conscious and becoming pride, 'remember that you are indebted to us for your emancipation from papal thralldom. We led the way. We stood in the front rank, and against us the first thunder-bolts of Rome were fulminated. The baying of the bloodhounds of the inquisition was heard in our valleys before you

knew its name. They hunted down some of our ancestors, and pursued others from glen to glen, and over rock and mountain, till they obliged them to take refuge in foreign countries. A few of these wanderers penetrated as far as Provence and Languedoc, and from them were derived the Albigenses, or heretics of Albi. The province of Guienne afforded shelter to the persecuted Albigenses. Guienne was then in your possession. From an English province our doctrines found their way into England itself; and your Wickliffe preached nothing more than what had been advanced by the ministers of our valleys, four hundred years before his time.' 'Whence,' continued my aged informant, with increased animation, 'came your term *Lollards*, but from a Waldensian Pastor, Walter Lollard, who flourished about the middle of the thirteenth century? And the Walloons of the Low Countries were nothing more than a sect, whose name is easily found in the corruption of our own. As for ourselves, we have been called heretics, and Arians, and Manicheans, and Cathari, but we are, like yourselves, a Church built up in Christ, a Church with the discipline and regular administration of divine service, which constitutes a Church. We have adhered to the pure tenets of the Apostolic age, and the Roman Catholics have separated from us. Our's is the Apostolical succession, from which the Roman hierarchy has departed, rather than ourselves. We are not only a Church by name and outward forms, but a Church actually interested by faith in Jesus Christ the corner-stone.'"

The intelligent and impartial reader, who will take the trouble of comparing what has been adduced in this article with the extracts which will appear in the next from Froude's Remains, conveying his opinions concerning the Reformers and the Reformation on the one hand, and the Church of Rome on the other, will be enabled to judge whether the Romanists have not good reason for looking upon the writers of the Oxford Tracts as useful auxiliaries, and whether credit may not be given to them for sincerity, when they profess to rejoice at the religious movement which

has emanated from Oxford. That they view with deep interest, and, most probably, with undissembled satisfaction, the propagation of opinions so much in accordance with their own, may be gathered from the testimonies, which I am now about to subjoin.

The first which I shall bring forward is taken from a very subtle and ingenious sermon "on the Apostolical Succession," preached at the opening of a new chapel at Leeds, on Wednesday, Oct. 31st, 1838, by a Priest of the name of Walker.—"And now, my brethren," says the preacher, "I beg to call your attention to certain doctrines, bearing upon these subjects, which have lately been proclaimed,—proclaimed, I may venture to say, to the general amazement. I need not inform you that I allude to the doctrines so zealously maintained by certain learned theologians of Oxford, and their advocates elsewhere.

"Before I proceed to notice any of these doctrines in particular, I will make a few observations upon them in general.

"In the first place, then, there is remarkable about them, that the preaching of them at this day seems to scatter dismay through the ranks of every party, save the Catholic alone. Whatever may be the cause (I stay not to enquire what it may be) it cannot escape observation, that while all others look upon the spread of these doctrines as they do upon the mustering of the storm, the Catholics hail it as they do the rising of the summer cloud.

"In the next place, whatever diversity of opinion there may be, however differently men may speculate upon their tendency and ultimate consequences, all are unanimous in this,—that they bespeak in those who hold them and preach them a satiety of things as they are, and a longing desire to restore, if they knew how to restore it, the ancient faith of this land and of Christendom. Here again the Catholics lift up their heads like men comforted. It is refreshing, after years of persecution for our adherence to the religion of our fathers, after hearing their doctrines and their rites scoffed at so long, as unchristian and idolatrous, to find men, nurtured in the bosom of another Church, and

ornaments of it,—for that cannot be denied,—proclaiming aloud, fearless of every consequence, that in very deed and truth there has been a delusion over the land, that the Reformation is not that blessing which it has been deemed to be—that it went too far—that it lopped what it ought not to have lopped away,—that they of those days had better have stood more by the ancient land-marks,—and that it is high time to return, or, that the very Christianity of the land is endangered. I say it is beyond measure refreshing to find, from the admission of men like these, that some of our most unpopular doctrines—the doctrine of the real presence and eucharistic sacrifice, the doctrine of prayer for our departed brethren, the doctrine of communion with the saints in heaven, the long derided holiness of fasting and other penitential practices—it is cheering to find, notwithstanding parliamentary acts and articles, that these doctrines really are portions of the faith once delivered to the saints, and ought not to have been discarded as at the Reformation they were discarded.”—*Catholic Magazine*. No. xxv. Feb. 1839, p. 79. In the eighty-eighth page of the same discourse, the preacher speaks of these writers as the “brightest ornaments” of the Church of England, “whom, as men, it is impossible not to admire, and, as Catholics, not to love; inasmuch as their hearts have been manifestly touched with the Catholic spirit, and their eyes captivated with the beauty and grandeur of the ancient faith.”

A writer in the *Dublin Review*, speaking of “that remarkable revulsion of feeling and principle, which the late publications of the Oxford press display,” observes,—“We regard this remarkable religious movement with the deepest interest, and we look forward to the issue with the most assured hope.”—*Dublin Review*. No. xiv. Nov. 1839.

The account given by the Rev. T. S. Grimshawe, in his speech at the Thirty-fifth Anniversary of the British and Foreign Bible Society, held at Exeter Hall, May the 1st, 1839, of the state of public feeling in Rome, with reference to the prospects of Popery

in this country, shall conclude this article.—“It is the prevailing impression, at this time, in Rome, among the Priests—indeed among all classes that are well informed there,—that we are on the very eve of abandoning the principles of Protestantism, and going over to the Roman Catholic faith. Now I pledge myself to the truth of that fact : it is no secret : it is the usual congratulation with which they approach you. There is a kind of fraternal embrace which they are willing to give ; and the foundation of this regard is, a supposed assimilation of feeling and principle, and that we are on the verge of embracing the Roman Catholic faith. I asked the question, and a friend of mine asked the same, —‘ Pray, upon what evidence do you ground this supposition ? ’— ‘ We ground it,’ they replied, ‘ upon facts that are too obvious and too well known to require being stated.’ We requested that they would state those facts—state them in detail, and argue the point, if necessary, to establish them. Now, though I do not think it would be prudent to enter into all the arguments that were brought forward, I would beg to say, that, among the causes which they assigned for this supposition that we are on the point of joining the Roman Catholics, some were political, of which their admission into Parliament was a leading feature :—another was the multiplication of their places of worship by means of Protestant money, and with Protestant attendance, and Protestant concurrence : and then, last of all, they appealed,—and I am sure with a feeling of triumph on their part, which, upon mine, I felt as an insult,—they appealed to the state of one of our Universities. I lament to say it, I truly lament to re-echo the remark ; but the cause of truth requires me to be faithful, I impeach no man : I do not impeach that body of men whom I allude to. I candidly acknowledge their claims to piety, and to zeal, probably far superior to my own ; though I must as candidly acknowledge, that I do not concur in their interpretation of truth. But I feel it necessary to state, that our friends at Rome said,—‘ Go to Oxford,—go to your seat of learning,—not a place in a corner,—not

a place marked by ignorance, but where science has established her banner,—the place where your youth are educated for all your professions,—and from whence your Ministers are to be supplied; go, and look there! **THEY ARE DOING OUR WORK SO EFFECTUALLY, THAT WE HAVE NO NEED TO DO IT FOR OURSELVES.**—It was with profound grief that I heard such an imputation; and I am convinced that the authors of the writings referred to would repel the charge with indignation. But I would say, in conclusion, if these are the sentiments they form in Rome, what ought we to be doing in Great Britain?—I trust that we shall remember that there were once men called by the honoured names of Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley; and that one of them said, ‘Be of good courage, Master Ridley, and play the man: we shall this day light such a candle by God’s grace in England, as, I trust, shall never be put out!’ If Rome thinks that that flame is now approaching the moment of its extinction, I pray that we may add fresh fuel and fresh materials to it: and while, in France, the Roman Catholic Prelates have met (in those parts of the country to which I have alluded) to enquire what can be done to check the progress of Protestantism, let it be our resolution to enquire what we can do, as Protestants, to resist the progress of Romanism.”

No. 2.

IF, after the animadversions which had been made upon the first part of Mr. Froude’s Remains, even, in some instances, by partisans of the Oxford Tracts, the Editors had quietly suffered it to sink into merited oblivion, instead of launching forth a second part, and prefixing to the latter a preface, in which his contemptuous treatment of the Reformers is vindicated; I should have deemed it uncandid and ungenerous to have dragged the former again before the public. But, since they have so little consulted the character and credit of their departed friend and coadjutor, as

to subject his opinions again to discussion, justice to the Reformers, whom, as it appears to me, he has calumniated and maligned, supersedes the necessity of any such forbearance.

To what extent the passages, which I shall have occasion to cite, may have previously appeared in print, I cannot take upon myself to say. In my selection, I shall be influenced chiefly, if not exclusively, by their apparent connexion with some of the topics which are touched upon either in the Charge, or this Appendix. The main object which I shall have in view will be to shew that, in the prejudice which he betrays against the Reformation, and in the acrimonious spirit which he evinces towards the principal agents whom the Providence of God selected for the purpose of effecting that glorious work, by which the Protestant nations of Europe were emancipated from the thralldom of Popery, he is scarcely to be surpassed by the most bigoted Romanist.

Lest any should impute some of his more astounding propositions to a love of paradox, and an affectation of originality, the Editors in the preface carefully guard against any such supposition. To obviate it, they remark that, "Many recoiling from his sentences, so direct, fearless, and pungent, concerning all sorts of men and things, will be fain to account them speeches uttered at random, more for present point and effect, than to declare the speaker's real opinions; and, so judging, will of course disapprove of the collecting and publishing such sayings, especially on high and solemn subjects, as at best incautious, and perhaps irreverent. But they who judge thus must be met by a denial of the fact. The expressions in question were not uttered at random: he was not in the habit of speaking at random on such matters."—Preface to 1st Part of Remains of the late Reverend R. H. Froude, p. xix. Whatever, therefore, he propounds in depreciation of the Reformers, is to be considered as the result of his mature and deliberate conviction.

Even in the preface a remark is made, which, from the terms in which it is couched, plainly indicates the feelings of the author

and of his Editors towards Luther and those who carried on the great work, in which he had so large a share. It is drily and sarcastically observed (p. xv.) that,—“doubtless, the spirit in which the present establishment was framed, would require an affectionate admiring remembrance of Luther and others, for whom there is no evidence that the author of these volumes ever entertained any reverence.”

In a letter, dated Jan. 29, 1832, Mr. Froude says :—“I have been very idle lately ; but have taken up Strype now and then, and have not increased my admiration of the Reformers. One must not speak lightly of a martyr, so I do not allow my opinions to pass the verge of scepticism. But I really do feel sceptical whether Latimer was not something in the Bulteel line ; whether the Catholicism of their formulæ was not a concession to the feelings of the nation, with whom Puritanism had not yet become popular, and who could scarcely bear the alterations which were made ; and whether the progress of things in Edward the VI's minority, may not be considered as the jobbing of a faction. I will do myself the justice to say, that those doubts give me pain, and that I hope more reading will, in some degree, dispel them. AS FAR AS I HAVE GONE, TOO, I THINK BETTER THAN I WAS PREPARED TO DO OF BONNER AND GARDINER.”—Remains, p. 251.

In a letter, bearing date, Feb. 17, of the same year, he says :—“I have been looking into Strype's Memorials, and Burnet a good deal, without finding much to like in the Reformers ; but I do not see clearly the motives of the different parties. The sincerity of the leading men on both sides seems so equivocal, that I can hardly see what attached them to their respective positions. * * * * The person whom I like best of all I have read about is Cardinal Pole. He seems a hero of an ideal world, an union of chivalrous and Catholic feeling, like what one hopes to find people before one reads about them.”—Remains, p. p. 253, 254.

In a letter written from Naples, after giving a very unfavourable

account of the morality of the inhabitants, he adds :—"I think people are injudicious who talk against the Roman Catholics for worshipping saints, and honouring the Virgin, and images, &c. ; these things may perhaps be idolatrous,—I cannot make up my mind about it,—but to my mind it is the carnival which is real practical idolatry, as it is written, *the people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play.*" Such is the judgment of a man, the truth and extreme importance of whose views, according to the Editors, afford a sufficient apology "for the very magnitude of the collection," which they have made of his "various writings for publication."—Preface, p. v. It is to be presumed that the author is the first Protestant Divine, who ever doubted whether the worship of saints constituted idolatry. Such, at least, was not the opinion of the Reformers, as appears, not only from their writings generally, but specially from the homily "against peril of idolatry." But their opinion carries no weight either with the author or his Editors. He must, indeed, have been very ignorant of the history of all idolatry, both ancient and modern, not to have perceived that the licentiousness of the carnival is its legitimate offspring. The identical transaction to which he refers, by citing Exodus xxxii. 6., might have taught him their mutual connexion. The manner in which this act of apostasy is referred to by St. Paul, (1 Cor. x. 7.) might have shewn him that the one is the natural concomitant of the other. *Neither*, says the Apostle, *be ye idolaters, as were some of them ; as it is written, The people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play.* Whitby's remark on these words is deserving of notice in reference to this subject. "The exposition of the Ancients, that they rose up to dance before the calf, is confirmed by these words, *And when Moses saw the calf and the dancing he was wroth.* Ex. xxxii. 19. And because this was done after the manner of the heathen, and was one of the rites by which they honoured their gods, the APOSTLE USETH IT AS A CONFIRMATION OF THEIR IDOLATRY."—Whitby. In loco.

Let the admirers of Mr. Froude read with attention a Sermon of Archbishop Usher's, on 1 Cor. x. 17., from which the following is an extract, and they will not find there the same indecision. "But to come nearer yet unto that which is idolatry most properly. An idol, we must understand, in the exact propriety of the term, doth signify an image; but, according to the ecclesiastical use of the word, it noteth such an image as is set up for religious adoration. **AND IN THIS LATTER SENSE WE CHARGE THE ADHERENTS OF THE CHURCH OF ROME WITH GROSS IDOLATRY; BECAUSE THAT, CONTRARY TO GOD'S EXPRESS COMMANDMENT, THEY ARE FOUND TO BE WORSHIPPERS OF IMAGES.** Neither will it avail them here to say that the idolatry forbidden in Scripture, is that only, which was used by Jews and Pagans. The Apostle indeed, in this place, exhorting Christians from idolatry, propoundeth the fall of the Jews in this kind before their eyes:—*Neither be ye idolaters, saith he, as some of them were.* And so doth he also add concerning another sin, in the verse following:—*Neither let us commit fornication, as some of them committed.* As well then might one plead that only Jewish or heathenish fornication were here reprehended, as Jewish or heathenish idolatry. But as the one is a foul sin, whether it be committed by Jew, Pagan, or Christian; so if such as profess the name of Christ, shall practice that which the Word of God condemneth in Jews and Pagans for idolatry, their profession is so far from diminishing, that it augmenteth rather, the heinousness of the crime. *The idols of the heathen are silver and gold, the work of men's hands,* saith the Psalmist; and so the idols (of Christians, in all likelihood) mentioned in the Revelation, are said to be *of gold, and silver, and brass, and stone, and of wood; which neither can see, nor hear, nor walk.* The description of these idols, we see, agreeth in all points with Popish images: where is any difference?"—Usher's Answer to a Jesuit; and other Tracts, p. 673.

In a letter of August 31, 1833, the author applies the epithet of "odious" to Protestantism, coupled with an expression not remarkable for its refinement, (as is the case with other terms which he sometimes uses—such as "bother," "humbug," &c.)—"I must go," he observes, "about the country to look for the stray sheep of the true fold; there are many about I am sure; **ONLY THAT ODISIOUS PROTESTANTISM STICKS IN PEOPLE'S GIZZARD.**"—Remains, p. 322.

In another, bearing date Sept. 16, 1833, he remarks, "——— has sent me your resolutions for our association, which I think excellent, only I should like to know why you flinch from saying that the power of making the body and the blood of Christ is vested in the successors of the Apostles: it seems to me much simpler and less open to cavil, than 'continuance and due application of the sacrament.' I suppose all dissenters think they have positive evidence that their own ways are best calculated for the 'continuance and due application,' &c. They cannot say this about the other, since, in the nature of things, it admits of no evidence, except the bible and tradition."—Remains, p. 326.

Neither of the modes of expression, here mentioned, appears to me very appropriate, or very correct. But what authority can be found in the bible for the idea that any succession of men can "make the body and the blood of Christ?" That the individual, whose name is suppressed, if he had not entirely renounced his "odious Protestantism," should demur at the adoption of such phraseology, might naturally have been anticipated. He must have been fully aware that while such language would harmonize with the theory of transubstantiation, it could not be easily reconciled with the Protestant view of the eucharist. The necessity of making an appeal to the evidence of tradition in favour of the expression of "making" the body and blood of Christ, seems to imply a consciousness of its tendency. If, however, any doubt could remain upon the reader's mind with reference to the author's meaning, it would be completely dispelled by the following

passages, which will be found in pages 391, and 410, respectively. "I am more and more indignant at the Protestant doctrine on the subject of the eucharist, and think that the principle on which it is founded is as proud, irreverent, and foolish, as that of any heresy, even Socinianism." "By the bye, the more I think over that view of your's about regarding our present Communion Service, &c., as a judgment on the Church, and taking it as the crumbs from the Apostle's table, the more I am struck with its fitness to be dwelt upon as a tendency to check the intrusion of irreverent thoughts, without in any way interfering with one's just indignation." In opposition to the Protestant doctrine alluded to with so much abhorrence in the first of these two extracts, he adduces the doctrine of Pascal. Since by a curious coincidence, the same passage is quoted with approbation by the author of the Tract on Reserve, in Dr. Kennet's translation, I will here give it, as it is cited by the latter. "Before the Incarnation, God remained hidden in the recesses of his Divinity; and after it, he became, in some respects, more hidden by putting on the veil of our humanity. It had been easier to have known him while invisible, than when he conversed in a visible shape: and at length, designing to accomplish the promise which he made to his Apostles, of continuing with his Church till his second coming, he chose a concealment more strange and obscure than either of the former, **UNDER THE SPECIES OF THE EUCHARIST.**" —80th. Tract, Note to p. 33. Upon this passage the author of "the Remains" observes, (p. 392.) "I believe you will agree with me that this is orthodox."

It is also worthy of remark that the bible and tradition are here placed upon the same footing, in respect of evidence. This is again done at p. 332, where the following question is proposed:—"May one not broadly maintain, that no one has any right to call any opinion necessary, unless he believes its necessity, as distinct from its truth, to be revealed, (**I MEAN IN SCRIPTURE OR TRADITION?**)"

With this manifest bias of the writer in favour of some of the tenets of Romanism, and unable, as he had before avowed himself to be, to decide whether the worship of saints was itself idolatrous, it can create no astonishment that his prejudices against the Reformers, instead of subsiding, should, by degrees, become more deeply rooted. That such was the case appears from the manner in which he speaks of them collectively, and of Bishop Jewell specially, in p. 379:—"As to the Reformers, I think worse and worse of them. Jewell was what you would in these days call an irreverent dissenter. His Defence of his Apology disgusted me more than almost any work I have read." It may, perhaps, be some consolation to the admirers of Jewell, if consolation they need, to apprise them that a very different estimate of his character and writings was formed by one to whom he had been a kind benefactor and who was that, which the author of "the Remains" was not, viz., capable of appreciating his merits. In B. ii. § 5. 6, of the "Ecclesiastical Polity," Hooker cites two passages from Bishop Jewell's "Defence of the Apology," and introduces them by designating the writer as "the worthiest Divine that Christendom hath had for the space of some hundreds of years." Isaac Walton, in his life of Hooker, after giving an interesting account of the last interview which he had with the Bishop, when he passed through Salisbury, proceeds to say:—"But, alas! the next news that followed Mr. Hooker to Oxford was, that his learned and charitable patron had changed this for a better life. Which may be believed, for that, as he lived, so he died, in devout meditation and prayer; and in both so zealously, that it became a religious question, whether his last ejaculations, or his soul did first enter heaven."—Life of Hooker, prefixed to the folio edition of the "Ecclesiastical Polity," p. 4. To these testimonies, I will add that of Fuller. "A Jewell (sometimes taken for a single precious stone) is properly a collection of many, orderly set together to their best advantage. So several eminences met in this worthy man. Naturals, artificials, (amongst which I recount his

studied memory, deserving, as well as Theodectes the Sophister, the surname of Mnemonicus) morals, spirituals. So devout in the pew where he prayed, diligent in the pulpit where he preached, grave on the bench where he assisted, mild in the consistory where he judged, pleasant at the table where he fed, patient in the bed where he died, that well it were, if, in relation to him, "Secundum usum Sarum," were made precedential. He gave at his death, to Peter Martyr, a golden rose (yet more fragrant for the worth of the giver, than the value of the gift)—to the city of Zurich a present, which they converted into a piece of plate with Jewell's arms thereon,—to several scholars large legacies,—to the Church of Salisbury a fair library—and another to the Church of England, I mean his learned Apology."—Fuller's Church History of Britain. B. ix., § 5. 3., p. 101.

But the evidences of the Author's increasing rancour and malevolence towards the Reformers are not yet exhausted. In a letter of the date of Dec. 26, 1834, after observing,—“I don't know what money I left, little enough I suspect; but, whatever it was, I am superstitious enough to think that any good it would do ‘in honorem Dei et sacrosanctæ Matris Ecclesiæ,’ would have done something too in salutem animæ meæ;” he very naturally anticipates “a rowing for his Roman Catholic sentiments.” He then adds, in the same letter,—“Really I hate the Reformation and the Reformers more and more, and have almost made up my mind that the rationalist spirit they set afloat is the ψευδοπροφητης of the Revelations.”—Remains, p. 388, 389.

Again, at p. 393, the Author of “the Remains” asks,—“Also why do you praise Ridley? Do you know sufficient good about him to counterbalance the fact that he was the associate of Cranmer, Peter Martyr, and Bucer? N.B. How beautifully the Edinburgh Review has shown up Luther, Melancthon, and Co. ! What good genius has possessed them to do our dirty work? *

* * * * * *Pour moi*, I never mean, if I can help it, to use any phrases even, which connect me with such a set. I shall

never call the Eucharist 'the Lord's supper,' nor God's Priests 'the Ministers of the word,' or the altar 'the Lord's table,' &c. &c.; innocent as such phrases are in themselves, they have been dirtied; a fact of which you seem oblivious on many occasions. Nor shall I even abuse the Roman Catholics *as a Church* for any thing except excommunicating us."

Such were the opinions of the Author, concerning the Reformation and the Reformers, as they are recorded in his letters to his friends. The following are introduced as having been propounded in conversation.—"The Reformation was a limb badly set—it must be broken again in order to be righted."—"I wonder a thoughtful fellow like H. does not get to hate the Reformers faster. [*How soon did you begin to hold your present views about them?*]"—I think as soon as I began to know ———, I felt they were the very kind of fellows he would most have hated and despised if he had known them. But I did not dare to sport my opinions, till I had read more and got him to agree with me. I believe I have a want of reverence, else I should not have got to hate them so soon as I did. ——— used sometimes to give me such snubs for speaking disrespectfully of them, that I did not recover them for a week or fortnight. He was a long time giving up Cranmer." With such instances as these of approximation to Romanism on the one hand, and disaffection to Protestantism on the other, it can excite no surprise that a writer in the Dublin Review should have regarded them as subservient to the advancement of the former. Accordingly, he brings forward many, if not all, of the passages which I have quoted with this prefatory remark,—"*A symptom,*" (i.e. "of his having been prevented by his premature death from reaching the goal of Catholic unity") "*which begins at first more faintly, and then deepens in intensity towards the end of his life, is a disgust for Protestantism and the so called Reformation.*"—Dublin Review, No. xii. May, 1839, p. 424.

After adducing some of those parts of his letters, in which the

Author of "the Remains" expresses his indignation at "the Protestant doctrine of the sacrament of the Lord's supper," and in which he states his own views, the Reviewer makes the following observations:—"These passages show how far prepared he was to outstrip his friends in approximation to Catholic doctrines and Catholic expressions. For when once it is conceded that by the words of consecration bread and wine *are made* the Body and Blood of Christ; and that in such sort, as that not only is the Body present when received, but that it may be actually said to be in the hand of one who holds the sacred *species*; (Pascal's term, quoted by the Author of "the Remains" and of the Tract on Reserve,) "very little indeed, beyond the fitting forms of expression, and the terms to embody these doctrines, is wanting for the complete assent to the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist." p. 428. In the conclusion of the article the Reviewer asks,— "After this, what more can we desire in proof of what we asserted at the beginning of this article, that these 'Remains' prove Mr. Froude's mind to have been gradually discovering more extensive and more accurate views of religious truths and the principles of faith, with such steady and constant growth, as gives us every reason to believe that longer life alone was wanting to see him take the salutary resolve, to embrace the conclusions of his theories to their fullest legitimate extent?"—P. 435.

No one who is acquainted with the writings of the Reformers, in which the doctrines of the atonement and the agency of the Holy Spirit are so conspicuous, will feel much astonished that they should have scarcely any place (so far as I can recollect) in the journal or letters of Mr. Froude. Considering his entire alienation from the Reformers, and the contempt in which he held them—it was not to be expected that his doctrinal views would harmonize with those which they espoused. Accordingly, in a note at the end of the extracts from his journal, the Editors attempt to vindicate "the absence of any distinctive mention of our Lord and Saviour, in the prayers and meditations it contains."

The validity of the pleas which they advance may be estimated differently by different persons. To me they appear utterly futile and nugatory.

But, whatever may be urged in palliation of the Author's silence upon these fundamental points in his journal, and in his correspondence with his friends, nothing can justify their omission, to nearly a similar extent, in his sermons. These specimens of his addresses from the pulpit convey to my mind a most unfavourable impression of the nature of his theological views. They seem to me strikingly deficient both in the exhibition, and in the application of the peculiar doctrines of Christianity. Far, indeed, be from me any wish to exaggerate defects, or to practise the slightest misrepresentation. But I feel assured that I could not be justly accused of doing either the one or the other, were I to affirm that a Socinian would have no difficulty in preaching more than half of the twenty sermons in the second volume without any alteration, as far as the doctrines contained in them are concerned. In the standard of morality which they set up, and the inculcation of self-denying duties, they are doubtless superior to those which a Socinian might be expected to deliver.

The obscurity and incorrectness of the Author's views are singularly exemplified in the beginning of his sermon on John iii. 12.—*If I have told you earthly things and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell you of heavenly things?* He opens the subject with the following statement, which appears to me very foreign to the purport of the words:—"The doctrines which the New Testament inculcates on us are of two sorts. One sort consists of those simple rules for virtuous conduct, which all good men had known and endeavoured to act upon in all ages, and which the Heathens ought to have known as well as the Jews; for instance, such as veracity, purity, charity, piety, in short, all that is called natural religion; all that human reason, assisted by the natural light of conscience, might have taught to persons anxious after the truth. AND IT IS OF THIS CLASS OF

DOCTRINES THAT OUR LORD HERE SPEAKS UNDER THE TITLE OF EARTHLY THINGS." —The preacher then begins the next paragraph with affirming that—"The other class of doctrines, which are opposed to these under the title of heavenly things, are those mysterious truths, which we could not have known except by a revelation from God, and which he has thought fit to communicate to us by messengers especially commissioned for that purpose."—Remains. 1st part, vol. ii. p. 58.

Upon this exordium, I would remark, in the first place, that I do not recollect ever before to have heard the "simple rules for virtuous conduct" styled "doctrines." It is certainly an unusual term to apply to moral duties. But when the preacher asserts that these "doctrines," as he calls them, were the *earthly things* of which our Lord spake, a much higher authority than that of any contemner of the Reformers must be adduced before I should be disposed to admit the truth of his proposition. Indeed I never remember to have met with a gloss put upon a text, which was so little warranted by the context. It is obvious that the *earthly things*, which are here contrasted with the *heavenly*, must have a reference to the preceding part of our Saviour's discourse with Nicodemus, on the subject of regeneration; and more especially, perhaps, to the similitude which he had borrowed from the agency and effects of the wind to illustrate the operation of the Holy Spirit in renovating the fallen nature of man.

Pole, in his Synopsis, gives the following commentary upon this verse:—"Sic vocat (viz. *terrena*) respiciens, vel. 1. ad res ipsas, de quibus loquebatur,—mysteria inferiora, Evangelii rudimenta, intellectu faciliora, qualia sunt, vel resurrectio ipsius, de quâ dixit, Joh. ii. 20, 21, vel baptismus, res ipsis nota atque usitata, et regeneratio. *Terrena* autem hæc vocat, aut quia in terris agebantur, vel purè cœlestibus comparata. Vel. ii. ad modum loquendi,—q.d. si stilo humili et perspicuo loquar, terreno, i.e. humano more. Sic, *secundum hominem loqui*, Gal. iii. 15,

est similitudines sumere a rebus humanis. Sic rem vobis explicavi comparatione rerum quas quotidie experimur, nempe naturalis nativitatis et venti.”—Poli Synopsis: in loco.

The fullest interpretation of this verse, that I have met with, is in Lightfoot's Works. In vol. p. 47, this learned writer observes,—“By *earthly things*, divers understand diversely: some conceive Christ's speech to look so far back as to his discourse with the people at Jerusalem at the passover, about building up of the temple in three days; and that his words do result to this sense,—‘It is no wonder, that thou dost not believe this high mysterious doctrine of regeneration, when the Jews could not entertain that more facile and plain doctrine of the resurrection of the Messias on the third day.’ Others retaining the same opinion, that *heavenly* and *earthly things* do signify the difference of more sublime and more facile doctrines, do expound it thus: ‘If ye believe not these plain and first rudiments of the doctrine of the gospel; namely, about regeneration,—how will you believe those high and sublime mysteries, about the eternal generation of the Son, the procession of the Holy Ghost?’ &c. But the most received construction of these words is this,—‘If ye believe not when I speak in a plain and low style, and explain things by earthly comparisons; how will you believe, if I should teach the great things of salvation in their own abstract and simple notions?’—linguâ angelorum, as Grotius expresseth it.—Christ is discoursing with Nicodemus about the nature of *the kingdom of heaven*, or the gospel-state. He first teacheth him about denying his birth-privilege from Abraham, and about the doctrine of baptism by which a man is brought into that visible gospel-state:—‘And now (saith Christ) if you believe not, when I tell you of the *earthly things* of the kingdom of heaven,—i.e. those things that are most visible and apparent to be understood,—how will you believe, if I should speak of the high things of the kingdom,—the incarnation, righteousness by faith, peace and joy in the Holy Ghost?’ &c.” So much for “the extreme importance” of Mr. Froude's views as an expositor of Scripture!

In the eleventh sermon (p. 141) the following passage occurs:—"Instances are given us in scripture, as well of those who have begun the good course late, as who have begun it early; and the gate of heaven is not yet closed even against us. We may yet strive to enter in at the strait gate, though at a time of life when some have advanced far in their journey; we may begin even from this day proposing to ourselves the strict standard of duty which we have hitherto evaded; we may endeavour at least to amend our conduct, if it is too late thoroughly to amend our hearts; and we have God's assurance, that if we do this, he will accept our sincere though late attempts to serve him, in the place of that purity and simplicity of heart with which his own have followed him." The Author here manifests a scrupulous adherence to the principle of reserve with regard to the doctrine of the atonement. The influences of the Holy Spirit are likewise kept out of sight with equal care. Indeed it is implied that, in the case to which allusion is made, it may be too late "thoroughly to amend" the heart, though it may not be so to amend the conduct.

What the Author means by this distinction, it is not easy to divine. Possibly he had in his mind the opinion of Athanasius, in his comment on Rev. v. 6, upon which I animadverted in the Appendix to my last Charge, (p. 165) "that it is not impossible to repent, but, impossible on the ground of repentance to renew." In the absence, however, of this moral renovation of the heart, no real or lasting amendment of the heart can be expected: and, without it, no external reformation can be of any avail. It was this conviction which suggested the prayer of David, when he said,—*Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me.* The same truth is conveyed in the words of Solomon, and in those of a greater than Solomon;—*Keep thy heart with all diligence; for out of it are the issues of life.—Either make the tree good, and his fruit good; or else make the tree corrupt, and his fruit corrupt; for the tree is known by his fruit.* But neither an inward change of the heart, nor an outward amendment of the conduct can procure the pardon of sin,

or find acceptance in the sight of God, if disconnected from *the redemption which is in Christ Jesus ; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood.*

According, however, to the doctrine of the preacher, if we endeavour to amend our conduct, though it be too late thoroughly to amend our hearts, "we have God's assurance that he will accept our sincere though late attempts to serve him, in the place of that purity and simplicity of heart with which his own have followed him." Again, at p. 159, it is affirmed to the same effect, "that if we do sincerely strive to repent, God will accept our sincere endeavours to lead a new life instead of innocence." Where the "assurance" here spoken of is to be found, I know not : but this I do know, that such statements appear to me to be utterly irreconcilable with the whole scheme of man's salvation as revealed in the New Testament, and as it is set forth in the Articles and Homilies of our Church. Entertaining such sentiments as these, it is no wonder that the Author of the "Remains" should have been led to repudiate the authority of the Reformers, and to be content, as he says he was, (vol. i. p. 332) "to waive the Articles, keeping the Creeds, and so forth."

To investigate further the theological errors, which may be detected in these sermons, would require more time and more space than I can devote to that purpose. But it may be observed, that whoever reads them with attention, comparing them with the Author's journal, letters, &c., can scarcely avoid coming to the conclusion, that he must have omitted the negative particle in 1 Cor. ii. 2, reading it thus,—*I determined to know any thing among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified.*

No. 3.

IMPRESSED, as I am, with a deep and firm conviction that the remarkable prophecy of St. Paul, contained in 1 Tim. iv. 1—3. has a special reference to the Church of Rome, I have long wished

that the learned Joseph Mede's elaborate Treatise on that important passage, entitled, "The Apostasy of the Latter Times," were more generally known, and its merits, consequently, better appreciated. It would have been a source of great satisfaction to me, if my time would have allowed me to do any thing like justice to the deep research and irrefragable arguments by which this eminent writer fixes upon Romanism the guilt of this Apostasy. Nevertheless, considering the great importance of the question at the present crisis,—considering, moreover, its close connexion with the views entertained by the Fathers of the Ancient Church on the subjects of Fasting, Celibacy, and the memory of the Saints, which constitute, according to the Editors of Froude's Remains, some of the reasons why their teaching should be preferred to that of the Reformers, I am induced to make the attempt of presenting the reader with a concise outline of this valuable work. Whatever may be the imperfections of this outline, I trust that he will regard them as compensated by the quotations from the Author with which it will be enriched.

As this compendium may possibly fall into the hands of some who are but little acquainted with Joseph Mede's qualifications as an interpreter of prophecy, I will preface it with the admirable delineation of his character, which Bishop Hurd has given in his Warburtonian Lecture :—"He was," says this learned and elegant writer, "a candid, sincere man ; disinterested, and unambitious ; of no faction in religion or government, (both which began in his time to be overrun with factions) but solely devoted to the love of truth, and to the investigation of it. His learning was vast, but well chosen and well digested ; and his understanding, in no common degree, strong and capacious.

"With these qualities of the head and heart, he came to the study of the prophecies, and especially of the Revelations : but with so little bigotry for the scheme of interpretation concerning Antichrist, that, as he tells us himself, 'he had even conceived some prejudice against it : ' and, what is stranger still in a man of

his inventive genius, with so little enthusiasm in his temper for any scheme of interpretation whatsoever, that, when he had made his great discovery, he was in no haste to publish it to the world; and, when at length he did this, he was still less in haste to apply it, that is to shew its important use in explaining the Apocalyptic visions. Cool, deliberate, and severe, in forming his judgments, he was so far from being obsequious to the fancies of other men, that he was determined only, by the last degree of evidence, to acquiesce in any conclusions of his own. In short, with no vanity to indulge, (for he was superior to this last infirmity of ingenious men) with no interest in view, (for the interest of Churchmen lay at that time, as he well understood, in a different quarter) with no spleen to gratify, (for even neglect and solitude could not engender this unmanly vice in him) with no oblique purposes, I say, which so often mislead the pens of other writers, but with the single, unmixed love of truth, he dedicated his great talents to the study of the prophetic Scriptures.”—Sermon x. p. 328—331.

There can be no doubt that the authorised translation of 1 Tim. iv. 1, 2, is not quite correct. Accordingly, Mede substitutes the following as more in accordance with the original :—*Howbeit the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall revolt from the faith, attending to erroneous spirits and doctrines of dæmons, through the hypocrisy of liars, having seared consciences, forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, &c.* He then proceeds, in the first chapter, to shew the connexion of these words with the last verse of the preceding chapter; as if the Apostle had said :—“Though this mystery is a great one, (*the mystery of Godliness*) and at that time preached and believed on in the world: nevertheless, *the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times there shall be a revolt or departure from this faith,—though not in all parts of it,—yet from a main and fundamental part thereof, viz., the assumption of this God and man (God manifest in the flesh) to the throne of glory and incommunicable Majesty in heaven, whereby he hath a name*

given him above every name, and whereof no creature in heaven or in earth can be capable."

Afterwards he divides his subject into two parts, viz. :—

"I. A description of this solemn Apostasy.

"II. The manner or means whereby it was to come to pass."

He then remarks that the Apostasy may be expressed generally in the words :—they shall apostatize or revolt, and shall attend to erroneous doctrines, or doctrines of error.

This general head he then subdivides into five particulars, viz.

"1. What these erroneous doctrines should be for the kind or quality ; namely, new doctrines of dæmons, or a new idolatry.

"2. The persons who should thus apostatize ; not all, but **TINEE SOME**.

"3. The time when it should be ; *Εν ὑστέροις καιροῖς* *In the latter times*.

"4. The proof or warrant of this prophecy ; it is that which the Spirit hath elsewhere long ago foretold *ρητως* in the written word, *verbatim, totidem verbis*, or in express words.

"For the second part, viz. The means ; Consider,

"1. The manner or method used, viz. By lying hypocrisy or hypocritical lying.

"2. The quality and description of the Authors and furtherers thereof, they should be such as had their consciences seared, who forbade marriage and meats."—p. 768.

In the remaining part of the chapter he states the critical grounds which have induced him to adopt his own translation of the text,—grounds which must justify him in the opinion of every impartial and competent judge.

Ch. II. The learned Author now enters upon the 1st. division of his Treatise, "The description of this solemn Apostasy." In doing this, he gives a critical analysis of the expressions *αποσησονται της πισεως*, and *προσεχοντες πνευμασι πλανοις*. With regard to the former he observes that "*αποσασια* in the Scripture's use, when it looks towards a person, signifies a revolt, or rebellion ; when

towards God, a spiritual revolt from God, or rebellion against Divine Majesty—whether total—or by idolatry, and serving other gods.” Both of which he illustrates by passages from the Old Testament. He then shews that there is the same two-fold meaning of the expression in the New Testament; e. g. Heb. iii. 12.:—*Take heed lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief, ἐν τῷ ἀποστῆναι in departing from the living God.* And, which is more to the purpose, in 2 Thess. ii. 3. *ἐὰν μὴ ἔλθῃ ἡ ἀποστασία unless that Apostasy come first*, i.e. unless there be a breach of allegiance and faith given unto Christ, by idolatry, under Antichrist. This, therefore, is what is to be inferred from the words, *ἀποστήσονται τῆς πίστεως*, viz.:—“that in the latter times men should break their oath of fidelity to Christ, that in and through him alone they should approach and worship the Divine Majesty.”

But then, it may be asked, is this departing from Christ and *the mystery of Godliness* total, in not serving him at all,—or heretical, in serving others besides him? This question is answered by observing that the word *spirits* in this passage signifies properly *doctrines*, as in 1 John iv. 1. *Believe not every spirit*, i.e. *every doctrine*; *but try the spirits*, i.e. *the doctrines*, *whether they are of God*: because many *false prophets*, i. e. *teachers of false doctrines*, *are gone out into the world*. It seems, therefore, that some revolt from Christ by idolatry is intended, even in those who profess to worship him.

This view is fully confirmed by the next clause, which speaks of the *διδασκαλίας δαιμονίων*, the doctrines of dæmons—not the doctrines of which dæmons or devils were the Authors,—but the doctrines concerning dæmons. Mede’s inference from the whole, therefore, is that “the Gentiles’ idolatrous theology of dæmons should be revived among Christians.” What their system of dæmonology was is explained in the next chapter.

Ch. III. The learned Author thus begins this chapter:—“Let us first see what the Gentiles and their theologists understood by

dæmons ; which, when you have heard, I doubt not but you will confess the deifying and worshipping of Saints and Angels, with other facts of their idolatry who do this, to be as lively an image of the doctrine of dæmons as could possibly be expressed ; and such an one as whereby the Apostasy of the latter times is, as by a character, distinguished from the heresies, false doctrines, and corruptions, of all other times whatsoever." He then defines the dæmons to be, according to the polytheistic system of the Gentiles, "an inferior sort of deified powers, as a middle between the sovereign gods and mortal men." The former were supposed to be too exalted and sublime to be approached without the intervention of a "middle sort of divine powers," or mediators, whom they called *δαίμονες*, or *δαίμονια*, dæmons. "Thus Plato, in his Symposium, saith, 'God is not approached by men, but all the commerce and intercourse between gods and men is performed by the mediation of dæmons.'" Quotations to the same effect are adduced from the writings of Apuleius and Plutarch. Then passing from the Heathen Authors to a Christian writer, he mentions the titles of some of the chapters in Augustine, "*De civitate Dei*,"—such as,—"*Whether the gods do use dæmons for their messengers and interpreters*,"—and, "*Whether the friendship and favour of the celestial gods may be procured for man by the intercession of dæmons*;" upon which he observes :—"The reading of these titles alone were sufficient to shew what was the supposed office of the dæmons among the Gentiles."

He is of opinion that the prevalence of this false philosophy was the reason why St. Paul admonished the Colossians to beware lest they were spoiled with its *vain deceit, after the traditions of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ*. "For," he observes, "some Christians, even then, under a pretence of humility, of not approaching too nearly and too boldly to God, would have brought in the worshipping of angels instead of this of dæmons. But St. Paul tells them, that, as *in Christ dwelleth the fulness of the Godhead bodily*, in consequence of which he

needs no colleagues of mediation ;—so also were they *complete in him*, and needed therefore no agents besides him. *Let no man, therefore, saith he, beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind and not holding the head."* &c.

Ch. IV. In this chapter the origin of dæmons is traced ; and it is shewn that they were the souls of men who were deified after death. So that the canonization of the saints during the apostasy of the latter times, and their installation as mediators, or patrons, or protectors, was not an original invention of Christians who had fallen away from the purity of the Christian faith ; but was copied from the ancient heathen. Much learning is displayed in proof of this point. Amongst other quotations, a very appropriate one is given from the poet Hesiod, which is thus translated, or rather paraphrased by the Author,—“ When those happy men of the first and golden age of the world were departed this life, great Jupiter promoted them to be dæmons, that is, keepers, and protectors or patrons of earthly mortals, and overseers of their good and evil works, givers of riches, &c., and this, saith he, is the kingly royalty given them.” It is also proved that peculiar honours and respect, amounting to worship, were paid to the tombs and sepulchres of those, who, after having either died valiantly on the field of battle, or in any other way distinguished themselves by their patriotic virtues, were advanced to the rank of dæmons, or deified heroes.

Ch. V. In this chapter it is shewn that these dæmons, were worshipped through the medium of consecrated images and pillars. These images were supposed by their worshippers to be the residence of the souls or spirits of those gods or deified heroes to whom they paid their adoration. By an extract which the Author gives from the treatise of Arnobius against the Gentiles, it appears that the more intelligent among the Heathen disclaimed the idea of worshipping the inanimate and senseless

images themselves. This ancient writer candidly states in the following words what the Gentiles were accustomed to allege in their own defence.—“ We do not think brass, and gold, and silver, and other materials of images to be of themselves gods, and holy powers. But in these we reverence the gods brought into these images by sacred dedication, and keeping there.”

As a distinguished contemporary of Joseph Mede, who was his equal at least in abilities and extent of erudition has cited the same Father, together with Lactantius and Augustine, in order to shew the futility and utter worthlessness of the plea advanced by the Romanists to vindicate themselves from the charge of idolatry—a plea founded upon the groundless assumption that they contemplated images in a different point of view from the Heathen,—and as the arguments of both of these eminent writers tend mutually to illustrate and confirm each other, I will here quote from Archbishop Usher, (the contemporary alluded to,) a passage immediately following the one which was adduced in the last number of this Appendix.—“ The Heathen, say they,” (viz. the Romanists) “ held the images themselves to be gods, which is far from our thought. Admit some of the simpler sort of the Heathen did so; what shall we say of the Jewish idolaters, of whom the Apostle here speaketh, who erected the golden calf in the wilderness? Can we think that they were all so senseless as to imagine that the calf, which they knew was not at all *in rerum natura*, and had no being at that time when they came out of Egypt, should yet be that *God which brought them out of the land of Egypt*? And for the Heathen, did the Romans and Grecians, when they dedicated in several places an hundred images, for example, to the honour of Jupiter, the king of all their gods, think that thereby they had made an hundred Jupiters? or, when their blocks were so old that they had need to have new placed in their stead, did they think by this change of their images that they made change also of their gods? Without question they must so have thought, if they did take the very images themselves to be

their gods; and yet the Prophet bids us consider diligently, and we shall find that the heathen nations *did not change their gods*, Jerem. ii. 10, 11. Nay, what do we meet with more usually in the writings of the Fathers than these answers of the heathens for themselves? 'We worship the gods by the images.' 'We fear not them, but those to whose image they are made, and to whose names they are consecrated.' 'I do not worship that stone, nor that image which is without sense.' 'I neither worship the image nor a spirit in it; but by the bodily portraiture I do behold the sign of that thing which I ought to worship.'

"But admit they did not account the image itself to be God, will the Papist further say, yet were those images set up to represent either things that had no being, or devils, or false gods, and in that respect were idols; whereas we erect images only to the honour of the true God, and of his servants the saints and angels. To this I might oppose that answer of the heathen to the Christians: 'We do not worship evil spirits: such as you call angels, those do we also worship, the powers of the great God, and the ministers of the great God;' and put them in mind of St. Augustine's reply: 'I would you did worship them; you should easily learn of them not to worship them.' But I will grant unto them that many of the idolatrous Jews' and heathens' images were such as they say they were; yet I deny that all of them were such, and confidently do avouch, that idolatry is committed by yielding adoration to an image of the true God himself. For proof whereof (omitting the idols of Micah and Jeroboam, which were erected to the memory of Jehovah the God of Israel, as also the Athenians' superstitious worship of the *unknown God*, Acts xvii. 23, if, as the common use of idolaters was, they added an image to their altar,) I will content myself with these two places of Scripture, the one whereof concerneth the Jews, the other the heathen. That which toucheth the heathen is in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, where the Apostle having said that God had shewed unto them that which might be known of him,

and that *the invisible things of him*, that is, *his eternal power and Godhead*, were manifested unto them by the creation of the world and the contemplation of the creatures; he addeth presently, that God was sorely displeased with them, and therefore gave them up unto vile affections, because *they changed the glory of that uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible men, and to birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things*. Whereby it is evident, that the idolatry condemned in the wisest of the heathen was the adoring of the invisible God, whom they acknowledged to be the Creator of all things, in visible images fashioned to the similitude of men and beasts.”—Usher’s Answer to a Jesuit, and other Tracts, p. 674—676.

Ch. VI. The learned Author commences this chapter with a recapitulation of the points which he had already established. This recapitulation I will give in his own words, together with the application of it which immediately follows :—

“And thus have ye seen the theology of dæmons.

“1. For their nature and degree, to have been supposed by the Gentiles an inferior and middle sort of Divine powers between the sovereign and heavenly gods and mortal men.

“2. Their office, to be as mediators and agents between these sovereign gods and men.

“3. Their original, to be the deified souls of worthy men after death; and some of an higher degree, which had no beginning, nor ever were imprisoned in mortal bodies.

“4. The way to worship them, to find and receive benefits from them, namely, by consecrated images and pillars, wherein to have and retain their presence at devotions to be given them.

“5. To adore their relics, and to temple them.

“Now, therefore, judge impartially whether St. Paul’s prophecy be not fulfilled already amongst Christians, who foretold that the time should come that they should apostatize and revive again *Διδασκαλίας δαιμονίων*, doctrines of dæmons; whether the deifying and worshipping of saints and angels, whether the bowing down

to images, whether of men or other things visible, broaden idols, and crosses like new dæmon pillars, whether the adoring or templeing of relics, whether these make not as lively an image of the Gentiles' theology of dæmons [Διδασκαλίας Δαιμονίων] as possibly could be expressed; and whether these two words comprehend not the whole pith and marrow of Christian apostasy, which was to consist in spiritual fornication or idolatry, as appears by that name and denomination thereof given by S. John in his Revelation, *the whore of Babylon*. Is she not rightly termed the Babylonish whore, which hath revived and replanted the doctrines of dæmons first founded in the ancient Babel? And is not this now fulfilled which S. John foretels us, Apoc. xi. That the second and outmost court of the temple (which is the second state of the Christian Church) together with the holy city should be trodden down and overtrampled by the Gentiles (that is, overwhelmed with the Gentiles' idolatry) forty two months?"

He then proceeds to notice two objections which he supposes that the Romanists may make to this application. The first is,—do not the scriptures always take the word δαιμόνιον in a bad sense, as signifying the devil, or an evil spirit? The second is,—should the invocation of glorified saints, "as mediators and agents for us with God," be denounced as idolatry?

The first objection is completely answered by a critical examination of Acts xvii. 18, 22. *He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods—ξένων δαιμονίων*, dæmon gods;—*ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious, ως δεισιδαιμονεστες*—*too full of dæmons already*. (Whitby says, "i.e. too much addicted to the worship of dæmons.")

But the Author's comment on Rev. ix. 18, which he likewise brings forward in reply to the first objection, is of so much importance that I will insert it at large in his own words:—

"In Rev. ix. 18, &c. the sixth trumpet from Euphrates brings an huge army upon the Christian world, which destroyeth a third part of men; and yet those which remained repented not of those

sins (ver. 20) for which these plagues came upon the earth, viz. that they should not worship *δαίμονια* and idols of gold, silver, and brass, and stone, and of wood, which can neither see, nor hear, nor walk. Is not this a comment upon the Apostle's prophecy in my text? The time which it concerns must needs fall in the last times; for it is the last trumpet save one. The place must be the Roman Empire, or Christian world; for that is the stage of all the seals and trumpets: and how could it be otherwise, seeing S. John at Patmos saw them coming from the great river Euphrates? whatsoever comes from thence, must needs fall upon the territory of the Roman Empire. To hold you no longer, the best expounders make it the Ottoman or Turkish invasion, which hath swallowed so great part of Christendom. But what people are they who in the Roman territory do in these latter times worship idols of gold, silver, brass, and stone, and wood? Are they Ethnicks? there is none such. Are they Jews? they cannot endure the sight of them. Are they Mahumetans? nay, they abhor it also. Then must they needs be Christians; and then must Christians too worship *δαίμονια*; for both are spoken of the same men. But what Christians do, or ever did worship devils formerly? But *dæmon-gods* (alas!) they do and long have done. Here therefore *δαίμονιον* is again taken in the common and philosophical sense, or at least, which is all one, for evil spirits worshipped under the names of *dæmons* and deceased souls."—P. 783.

In the conclusion of the chapter he cites a remarkable passage from Epiphanius, whom he describes as "one of the most zealous of the Fathers of his time, against saint-worship, then peeping,"—remarkable, not only as confirmatory of the meaning which he attaches to the term *δαίμονιον*, but also of his application of the prophecy of St. Paul. It is as follows:—"That also of the Apostle is fulfilled in these, *some shall apostatize from the sound doctrine, giving heed to fables and doctrines of dæmons*, for" (saith he) "they shall be worshippers of dead men, as they were worshipped in Israel."

Ch. VII. No sort of abridgment can possibly do any thing like justice to the profound metaphysics, the logical reasoning, and the clear and comprehensive knowledge of scripture which are displayed in this chapter. Suffice it to give the inference which the Author deduces from the whole, and which he illustrates in the most beautiful and appropriate manner:—

“To conclude, therefore, with the words of S. Paul, 1 Tim. ii. 5, *There is but one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.* As God is one, so is the Mediator one; for it is a god-like royalty, and therefore can belong but to one. There is but one God in heaven, without any other gods subordinate to him; therefore but one Mediator there, without any other mediators besides him. As for the angels and blessed saints, they have indeed a light of glory too; but they are but as lesser lights in that heaven of heavens. And therefore as where the sun shines, the lesser stars of heaven, though stars, give not their light to us: so where this glorious Sun Christ Jesus continually shineth by his presence, sitting at the right hand of God, there the glory of the saints and angels is not sufficient to make them capable of any flower of that Divine honour which is god-like, and so appropriate to Christ by right of his heavenly exaltation in the throne of Majesty. Whatsoever spirit saith otherwise, *ὁ κρατεῖ τὴν κεφαλὴν*, holds not the head, but is a Christ-apostate spirit, which denies the faith of Christ’s assumption into glory, and revives the doctrines of dæmons.”—P. 790.

In the conclusion of the chapter, he recommends the reader to study the eighth book of Theodoret “*de curandis Græcorum affectionibus*,” which book is on the subject of the Martyrs. To this recommendation he subjoins the translation of some passages in that work for the purpose of shewing that the beginning of the “apostasy of the latter times” may be traced to a quarter, where its rise could have been least expected. This Father of the fourth century, referring to Hesiod’s encomiastic description of dæmons quoted above, thus delivers his sentiments:—“If then the poet

[Hesiod] calls good men, after their decease, the guardians and preservers or deliverers of mortal men from all evil ; and accordingly the best of philosophers, in confirmation of the poet's saying, would have their sepulchres to be served and honoured : I beseech you, sirs, (he speaks to the Greeks) why do you find such fault with what we do ? For, such as were eminent for piety and religion, and for the sake thereof suffered death, we also call preservers and physicians : in no wise do we term them dæmons, (God forbid we should ever fall into such a desperate madness) but the hearty friends and servants of God.

"That the souls of holy men, even when they are out of the body, are in a capacity of taking care of men's affairs, Plato affirms in the eleventh book of his laws.

"The philosopher (you see) bids men believe even the vulgar reports [that is, the relations and stories which are commonly talked of concerning the care which deceased souls have of men :] but you do not only disbelieve us, and are utterly unwilling to hearken to the loud voice of the events or effects themselves.—

"The Martyrs' temples are frequently to be seen, famous for their beauty and greatness.

"They that are in health pray for the continuance thereof ; and they that have been long sick pray for recovery : the barren also pray for children. And they that are to take a long journey desire them [viz., the Martyrs] to be their companions, or rather their guides, in the journey.

"Not going to them as gods, but making application to them as to divine men and agents for them with God.

"Now that they who made faithful prayers, have obtained their petitions, clearly appears by the presents and gifts brought by the votaries as so many grateful acknowledgments of their recovery. Accordingly some do present (to be hung up in the Church) the effigies of eyes, others of hands ; and these made of gold or of silver.

“Nay the Martyrs have utterly abolished and wiped out of the minds of men the memory of those who were called gods.

“Our Lord God hath brought his dead (viz., the Martyrs) into the room and place (the temples) of your gods, whom he hath sent packing, and hath given their honours to his Martyrs. For in stead of the feasts of Jupiter and Bacchus are now celebrated the festivals of Peter and Paul, and Thomas and Sergius, &c., and other holy Martyrs.

“Wherefore since you see there is so much advantage by honouring the Martyrs, be persuaded, I beseech you, to flee from the error of dæmons; and making use of the Martyrs as so many lights and guides, follow the way which leads directly to God, &c.”—p. 791. Upon these passages Mede observes:—“Now judge whether διδασκαλία δαιμονίων hath hitherto been fitly applied or not.”

Since Basil, Gregory of Nazianzen, Gregory of Nyssa, Ephræm Syrus, and Chrysostom, all concurred with Theodoret in propagating these pernicious errors, and thus, by their ill-judged zeal, contributed to pave the way for the great apostasy,—and since translations from the writings of each of these Fathers are announced as preparing for publication under the editorial superintendence of Dr. Pusey, Mr. Keble, and Mr. Newman, this will be a suitable place for introducing some passages from them which have already been translated by a writer of no less celebrity than Sir Isaac Newton. These extracts will answer a two-fold purpose. In the first place, they will confirm, if that be necessary, the arguments of Joseph Mede. In the next place, they will more than justify the remarks which I had made in the beginning of the Charge, and the correctness of which this long article was partly intended to substantiate.

Sir Isaac Newton, having observed in a preceding paragraph that by the instances, which he had adduced, “we may understand the invocation of saints was now of some standing in Egypt, and that it was already generally received and practised there by the common people;” proceeds with his quotations:—

“Thus Basil a monk, who was made bishop of Cæsarea in the year 369, and died in the year 378, in his oration on the martyr Mamas, saith: ‘be ye mindful of the martyr; as many of you as have enjoyed him in your dreams, as many as in this place have been assisted by him in prayer, as many of you as upon invoking him by name have had him present in your works, as many as he has reduced into the way from wandering, as many as he has restored to health, as many as have had their dead children restored by him to life, as many as have had their lives prolonged by him:’ and a little after, he thus expresses the universality of this superstition in the regions of Cappadocia and Bithynia. ‘At the memory of the martyrs,’ saith he, ‘the whole region is moved; at his festival the whole city is transported with joy. Nor do the kindred of the rich turn aside to the sepulchres of their ancestors, but all go to the place of devotion.’ Again, in the end of the homily he prays, ‘that God would preserve the Church, thus fortified with the great towers of the martyrs:’ and in his oration on the forty martyrs; ‘these are they,’ saith he, ‘who obtaining our country, like certain towers afford us safety against our enemies. Neither are they shut up in one place only, but being distributed are sent into many regions, and adorn many countries.—You have often endeavoured, you have often laboured to find one who might pray for you: here are forty, emitting one voice of prayer.—He that is in affliction flies to these, he that rejoices has recourse to these: the first, that he may be freed from evil; the last, that he may continue in happiness. Here a woman praying for her children is heard; she obtains a safe return for her husband from abroad, and health for him in his sickness.—O ye common keepers of mankind, the best companions of our cares, suffragans and coadjutors of our prayers, most powerful ambassadors to God,’ &c. By all which it is manifest, that before the year 378, the orations and sermons upon the saints went much beyond the bounds of mere oratorical flourishes, and that the common people in the east were already generally corrupted by the monks with saint-worship.

“Gregory Nazianzen, a monk, in his sixth oration, written A.D. 373, when he was newly made Bishop of Sasima, saith : ‘Let us purify ourselves to the martyrs, or rather to the God of the martyrs :’ and a little after he calls the martyrs ‘mediators of obtaining an ascension or divinity.’ The same year, in the end of his oration upon Athanasius then newly dead, he thus invokes him : ‘Do thou look down upon us propitiously, and govern this people, as perfect adorers of the perfect Trinity, which in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, is contemplated and worshipped : if there shall be peace, preserve me, and feed my flock with me ; but if war, bring me home, place me by thyself, and by those that are like thee ; however great my request.’ And in the end of the funeral oration upon Basil, written A.C. 378, he thus addresses him : ‘But thou, O divine and sacred head, look down upon us from heaven ; and by thy prayers either take away that thorn of the flesh which is given us by God for exercise, or obtain that we may bear it with courage, and direct all our life to that which is most fitting for us. When we depart this life, receive us there in your tabernacles, that living together and beholding the holy and blessed Trinity more purely and perfectly, whereof we have now but an imperfect view, we may there come to the end of our desires, and receive this reward of the wars we have waged or suffered :’ and in his oration upon Cyprian, not the Bishop of Carthage, but a Greek, he invokes him after the same manner ; and tells also how a pious virgin named Justina, was protected by invoking the Virgin Mary, and how miracles were done by the ashes of Cyprian.

“Gregory Nyssen, another eminent monk and bishop, in the life of Ephræm Syrus, tells how a certain man returning from a far country, was in great danger, by reason all the ways were intercepted by the armies of barbarous nations ; but upon invoking Ephræm by name, and saying, ‘holy Ephræm assist me,’ he escaped the danger, neglected the fear of death, and beyond his hope got safe home. In the end of this oration Gregory calls upon Ephræm

after the following manner: 'But thou, O Ephræm, assisting now at the Divine altar, and sacrificing to the Prince of life, and to the most holy Trinity, together with the angels; remember us all, and obtain for us pardon of our sins, that we may enjoy the eternal happiness of the kingdom of heaven.' The same Gregory, in his oration on the martyr Theodorus, written A.D. 381, thus describes the power of that martyr, and the practice of the people. 'This martyr, saith he, the last year quieted the barbarous tempest, and put a stop to the horrid war of the fierce and cruel Scythians.—If any one is permitted to carry away the dust with which the tomb is covered, wherein the body of the martyr rests; the dust is accepted as a gift, and gathered to be laid up as a thing of great price. For to touch the relics themselves, if any such prosperous fortune shall at any time happen; how great a favour that is, and not to be obtained without the most earnest prayers, they know well who have obtained it. For as a living and florid body, they who behold it embrace it, applying to it the eyes, mouth, ears, and all the organs of sense; and then with affection pouring tears upon the martyr, as if he was whole and appeared to them: they offer prayers with supplication, that he would intercede for them as an advocate, praying to him as an officer attending upon God, and invoking him as receiving gifts whenever he will.' At length Gregory concludes the oration with this prayer: 'O Theodorus, we want many blessings; intercede and beseech for thy country before the common King and Lord: for the country of the martyr is the place of his passion, and they are his citizens, brethren and kindred, who have him, defend, adorn and honour him. We fear afflictions, we expect dangers: the wicked Scythians are not far off, ready to make war against us. As a soldier fight for us, as a martyr use liberty of speech for thy fellow-servants. Pray for peace, that these publick meetings may not cease, that the furious and wicked barbarian may not rage against the temples and altars, that the profane and impious may not trample upon the holy things. We acknowledge

it a benefit received from thee, that we are preserved safe and entire, we pray for freedom from danger in time to come : and if there shall be need of greater intercession and deprecation, call together the choir of thy brethren the martyrs, and in conjunction with them all intercede for us. Let the prayers of many just ones atone for the sins of the multitudes and the people ; exhort Peter, excite Paul, and also John the divine and beloved disciple, that they may be solicitous for the churches which they have erected, for which they have been in chains, for which they have undergone dangers and deaths ; that the worship of idols may not lift up its head against us, that heresies may not spring up like thorns in the vineyard, that tares grown up may not choak the wheat, that no rock void of the fatness of true dew may be against us, and render the fruitful power of the word void of a root ; but by the power of the prayers of thyself and thy companions, O admirable man and eminent among the martyrs, the commonwealth of Christians may become a field of corn.' The same Gregory Nyssen, in his sermon upon the death of Meletius, Bishop of Antioch, preached at Constantinople the same year, A.D. 381, before the bishops of all the east assembled in the second general Council, spake thus of Meletius. 'The bridegroom,' saith he, 'is not taken from us : he stands in the midst of us, tho we do not see him : he is a priest in the most inward places, and face to face intercedes before God for us and the sins of the people.' This was no oratorical flourish, but Gregory's real opinion, as may be understood by what we have cited out of him concerning Ephræm and Theodorus : and as Gregory preached this before the Council of Constantinople, you may thence know, saith Baronius, that he professed what the whole Council, and therewith the whole Church of those parts believed, namely, that the saints in heaven offer prayers for us before God.

"Ephræm Syrus, another eminent monk, who was contemporary with Basil, and died the same year ; in the end of his encomium or oration upon Basil then newly dead, invokes him after

this manner : ' Intercede for me, a very miserable man ; and recal me by thy intercessions, O father ; thou who art strong, pray for me who am weak ; thou who art diligent, for me who am negligent ; thou who art chearful, for me who am heavy ; thou who art wise, for me who am foolish. Thou who hast treasured up a treasure of all virtues, be a guide to me who am empty of every good work.' In the beginning of his encomium upon the forty martyrs, written at the same time, he thus invokes them : ' Help me therefore, O ye saints, with your intercession ; and O, ye beloved, with your holy prayers ; that Christ by his grace may direct my tongue to speak,' &c. ; and afterwards mentioning the mother of one of these forty martyrs, he concludes the oration with this prayer : ' I entreat thee, O holy, faithful, and blessed woman, pray for me to the saints, saying ; Intercede ye that triumph in Christ, for the most little and miserable Ephræm, that he may find mercy, and by the grace of Christ may be saved.' Again, in his second sermon or oration on the praises of the holy martyrs of Christ, he thus addresses them : ' We entreat you, most holy martyrs, to intercede with the Lord for us miserable sinners, beset with the filthiness of negligence, that he would infuse his Divine grace into us : ' and afterwards, near the end of the same discourse ; ' Now ye most holy men and glorious martyrs of God, help me a miserable sinner with your prayers, that in that dreadful hour we may obtain mercy, when the secrets of all hearts shall be made manifest. I am to day become to you, most holy martyrs of Christ, as it were an unprofitable and unskilful cup-bearer : for I have delivered to the sons and brothers of your faith, a cup of the excellent wine of your warfare, with the excellent table of your victory, replenished with all sorts of dainties. I have endeavoured, with the whole affection and desire of my mind, to recreate your fathers and brothers, kindred and relations, who daily frequent the table. For behold they sing, and with exultation and jubilee glorify God, who has crowned your virtues, by setting on your most sacred heads incorruptible and celestial

crowns; they with excessive joy stand about the sacred relics of your martyrdoms, wishing for a blessing, and desiring to bear away holy medicines both for the body and the mind. As good disciples and faithful ministers of our benign Lord and Saviour, bestow therefore a blessing on them all: and on me also, the weak and feeble, who having received strength by your merits and intercessions, have, with the whole devotion of my mind, sung a hymn to your praise and glory before your holy relics. Wherefore I beseech you stand before the throne of the divine Majesty for me Ephræm, a vile and miserable sinner, that by your prayers I may deserve to obtain salvation, and with you enjoy eternal felicity by the grace and benignity and mercy of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, to whom with the Father and Holy Ghost be praise, honour, and glory, for ever and ever. Amen.'

"By what has been cited out of Basil, the two Gregories, and Ephræm, we may understand that saint-worship was established among the monks and their admirers in Egypt, Phœnicia, Syria, and Cappadocia, before the year 378, this being the year in which Basil and Ephræm died. Chrysostom was not much later; he preached at Antioch almost all the time of Theodosius the Great, and in his sermons are many exhortations to this sort of superstition, as may be seen in the end of his orations on S. Julia, on St. Pelagia, on the martyr Ignatius, on the Egyptian martyrs, on Fate and Providence, on the martyrs in general, on St. Berenice and St. Prosdoce, on Juventinus and Maximus, on the name of Cœmetery, &c. Thus in his sermon on Berenice and Prosdoce: 'Perhaps,' saith he, 'you are inflamed with no small love towards these martyrs; therefore with this ardour let us fall down before their relics, let us embrace their coffins. For the coffins of the martyrs have great virtue, even as the bones of the martyrs have great power. Nor let us only on the day of this festival, but also on other days apply to them, invoke them, and beseech them to be our patrons: for they have great power and efficacy, not only whilst alive, but also after death; and much

more after death than before. For now they bear the marks or brands of Christ; and when they shew these marks, they can obtain all things of the King. Seeing therefore they abound with such efficacy, and have so much friendship with him; we also, when by continual attendance and perpetual visitation of them we have insinuated ourselves into their familiarity, may by their assistance obtain the mercy of God.'

"Constantinople was free from these superstitions till Gregory Nazianzen came thither A.D. 379; but in a few years it was also inflamed with it. Ruffinus tells us, that when the emperor Theodosius was setting out against the tyrant Eugenius, which was in the year 394, he went about with the priests and people to all the places of prayer; lay prostrate in haircloth before the shrines of the martyrs and Apostles, and pray'd for assistance by the intercession of the saints. Sozomen adds, that when the Emperor was marched seven miles from Constantinople against Eugenius, he went into a Church which he had built to John the Baptist, and invoked the Baptist for his assistance. Chrysostom says: 'He that is clothed in purple, approaches to embrace these sepulchres; and laying aside his dignity, stands supplicating the saints to intercede for him with God: and he who goes crowned with a diadem, offers his prayers to the tent-maker and the fisher-man as his protectors.' And in another place: 'the cities run together to the sepulchres of the martyrs, and the people are inflamed with the love of them.'"—Sir Isaac Newton's Observations upon the Prophecies of Daniel, and the Apocalypse of St. John, p. 218—229.

Ch. VIII. The object of this chapter is to prove that idolatry or spiritual fornication was to be the peculiar characteristic of the foretold apostasy, and that mark which was to distinguish it "from all other blasphemies, sects, and heresies, of what age or time soever." To establish this point three arguments are alleged.

1. It is evinced by the description given of this apostate Church in the beginning of Rev. xvii., especially in the 5th. verse,—*And upon her forehead was a name written, MYSTERY, BABY-*

LON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS, AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH. The very name of MYSTERY inscribed upon her forehead, shews, beyond all controversy, that she is the *mystery of iniquity*, which is directly opposed to the *great mystery of Godliness*.

2. St. Paul informs us, that the great apostasy should be ushered in by *strong delusions*, by *signs*, and *lying wonders*, 2 Thess. ii. 9. 11. Consider what corruptions of the Christian faith were thus introduced. How were the invocation of the Saints—the adoration of their shrines and relics—the worshipping of images—and, lastly, the idolatry of the mass upheld and advanced in the Church, but by the aid of these *signs* and *lying wonders*? The legendary tales and lying fictions of Romanism, abounding with narratives of forged miracles, sufficiently attest, not only the exact and punctual fulfilment of the prophecy, but also the truth of the distinction laid down in this chapter.

3. The third mark of this apostasy is its chronological date—in the *latter times*. But the adjustment or determination of this period the Author reserves for a subsequent part of this treatise.

Ch. IX. Two objections are here noticed, one is, that the charge of idolatry, or spiritual fornication, should rather be fastened on the Heathen. The other is, that Antichristianism cannot with propriety be imputed to those who acknowledge the true God and the Lord Jesus Christ.

The first objection is answered by remarking that both St. Paul and St. John predicted a defection from the faith, which was then future. But Heathen idolatry existed at that time, and had existed for ages before.

Moreover, the Mohammedan power cannot be the Antichrist or the *mystery of iniquity* foretold by the Apostles, because it fails in two decisive marks. In the first place, it had never possessed a footing in *that great city*, which in St. John's time *reigned over the kings of the earth*. In the next place, it could not with pro-

priety be called an apostasy, because its adherents had never embraced the Christian faith.

According to the train of argument pursued by the learned Author, the sin of the Jews, in grafting upon the worship of Jehovah that of Baalim and of the dæmon-gods of the surrounding nations, was strictly analogous to the sin of the apostate Church of Rome, in superadding the worship of Saints and images to that of the true God and his Son Jesus Christ. The former was denounced by the Prophets as spiritual fornication or adultery. The latter, therefore, justly entitles this corrupt Church to be styled **THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS, AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH.**

I would wish the reader especially to remark that Joseph Mede twice in this chapter denominates the Church of Rome **THE CHRISTIAN JEZEBEL**, and that he affirms that the same judgments as were denounced upon the idolatrous Jews, shall be inflicted upon her, when *great Babylon shall come in remembrance before God, to give unto her the cup of the wine of the fierceness of his wrath.*

In the conclusion of the chapter the learned Author pursues a very ingenious and original parallelism. He observes that "Antichrist is a counter-Christ, and, therefore his coming to be a counter-resemblance of the coming of Christ." Accordingly as the Jews, at the first advent of the Lord Jesus Christ, did not nationally recognize their expected Messiah, so Christians should beware lest, when Antichrist is come, they do not recognize in him the predicted character of the *man of sin*.

Ch. IX. The learned Author now comes to the second point which he intended to discuss, viz.: the persons who should thus apostatize, not all—but *times*, some. From various passages of Scripture he proves incontrovertibly that this expression does not necessarily imply a small or limited number; and that in this place it only means that the apostates were not to be all, without any exception. He says that the defection was to be a "solemn

and general one," because it is foretold as "such a one as whereby the outmost court of the temple of God should not only be profaned, but trodden down of Gentilism (Rev. xi.),—such a one as the world is said to wonder after the beast, and to worship him,—and such a one as should not only make war with the Saints, but overcome them. (Rev. xiii.)"

Here I must introduce a very long extract, consisting of nearly the whole of this chapter, because it appears to me completely to obviate all the difficulties which are supposed by some to attach to that view of the apostasy of the latter times, which Mede has supported by such irrefragable arguments.

"The observation, therefore, which this **TINEΣ SOME** affords us is, That the true Church of Christ was never wholly extinguished, nor the light of his gospel ever quite put out, no, not in the greatest darkness that ever was to overwhelm it. By the true Church of Christ I understand that holy society and company of believers, which as they accord and are joined together in one common faith of all divine truths needful to salvation, so are they also free from the fellowship of such enormous abominations and mortal errors as destroy and overturn it. This is that society whereof, by the grace of Almighty God, we glory to be the members; this that society which in the primitive times grew and flourished; this that society which (when the times foretold of the Church's eclipse came, and the great apostasy had overspread the face thereof) was indeed much impaired, endangered and obscured, but never was totally extinguished, but continued even under the jurisdiction of the *man of sin*, yea in Babylon itself where he had his throne: For doth not Christ at length say, Apoc. 18. 4., *Come out of her my people?* How could they come out thence, unless they had been there? Or how should *Antichrist sit in the temple of God*, 2 Thess. ii. 4., unless God's temple were even there where Antichrist sate? As a few living embers in a heap of dying ashes; as a little wheat in a field overgrown with weeds; as the lights of the heaven in a firmament overcast with clouds;

as a little pure gold in a great mass of dross and mixed metal : such was the faithful company of Christ in the apostate body of Christendom, the virgin Church in the midst of Babylon.

“ But, will our adversaries say, This is not sufficient to make you the true Church of Christ, because some of you have always been ; but you must prove also that you have always visibly been : for the true Catholic Church must not only never have been interrupted or extinguished, but it must have been a society visibly known unto the world, and not as embers in the ashes, but as a burning and shining flame.

“ But this objection deserves no answering ; because our adversaries (however they would dissemble it) do but play upon the present advantage, which they think their own Church hath in this point above ours : otherwise, when they forget the contention they have with us, and are in a calmer mood, they can be pleased to deliver other doctrine, which if they would be so ingenuous as always to remember, we needed not such a stir about the point of the Church’s visibility. For the difference between them and us hereabout is not so great as they would make it seem. They themselves, and the Fathers also, teach, that when Antichrist cometh, the visibility of the Church shall be eclipsed : nay they affirm more than we usually in that case require ; for then, they say, the use of the sacraments shall cease ; no eucharist, no mass, no public assemblies, yea all ecclesiastical jurisdiction shall be extinguished. But here lies all the difference ; they hold the glorious visibility of the true Church to have continued from the beginning unto this present, and the overshadowing of the light and eclipse of the glory thereof under Antichrist to be yet to come : we on the contrary maintain, the clouding of the Church’s visibility under the *man of sin* to have been already, and some part of the visible splendor thereof to be yet to come : both agreeing in this, that in the fatal apostasy the Church’s visibility and glory should cease : but we say, that time hath been already ; they say, it is yet to come : we say, that time of darkness was to continue

many ages ; they say, when it comes, it shall last but three single years and a half. Seeing therefore the whole controversy lies in the point of time, whether the Church's fatal apostasy be already past or yet to come ; it would be much the shorter and quicker course for both them and us to decide this controversy ; to examine the condition and quality of both religions by the holy Scriptures, where we have also, as St. Peter speaks, *a most sure word of prophecy, whereunto we shall do well if we take heed, as to a light shining in a dark place.*

"Now, though this answer be sufficient enough for the objection of our adversaries ; yet for the better understanding and clearer insight into the matter questioned, we will further consider, whether and in what manner or measure our Church may be said to have been visible during the prevailing apostasy, and in what respect again it was not visible ; and in both agreeable to the state of the true Church under the frequent apostasies of Israel.

"First, therefore, we must know that by a visible Christian society in this question is meant a society or company of Christian believers joined together in one external fellowship and communion of the same public profession and rule of faith, use of sacraments, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction ; for these make the outward form, and as it were shape of the Church, whereby this society is discernible from other societies of men : so that a society by this outside severed and distinguished from other societies, is a society visible and conspicuous to other societies of men.

"The question therefore is, whether that holy society of believers before mentioned, who accorded together in one common faith with us of all divine truths needful to salvation, and kept themselves free from such enormous abominations and mortal errors, which we now disclaim, as utterly annihilating that common faith, whether such a society as this has been in all ages, joined and distinguished by such a common outside from other companies, either of men in general, or Christians in special ; or in shorter, and perhaps plainer terms, thus, whether the society of men of our

Christian belief hath in all ages been for the outside a distinct ecclesiastical corporation from other societies of men.

“My answer is, that for the first ages it was so; not only thus visible, but easily discernible from all other societies of men whatsoever: but afterward, when the great apostasy we speak of surprised and deformed the beautiful spouse of Christ, then was not the virgin-company of Saints, our mother, a distinct external society from the rest of Christendom; but a part, yea and the only sound part, of that external and visible body whereof our adversaries boast their predecessors to have been members. For howsoever this our virgin-mother, for the inward and invisible communion of her sincere and unstained faith, were a distinct and severed company from the rest with whom she lived; yet, for the common principles of the Christian faith still acknowledged in that corrupt body of Christendom, she retained communion with them, and for the most part of that time of darkness continued an external part of the same visible body with the rest in gross called Christians; as being begotten by the same sacrament of baptism (as the Israelites in the like case of circumcision) taught in some part by the same word and pastors still continued amongst them, and submitting to the same jurisdiction and government, so far as these or any of these had yet some soundness remaining in them. But for the rest which was not compatible with her sincere and unstained faith, and which annihilated, in those it surprised, even those common grounds of Christianity otherwise outwardly professed; she with her children either wisely avoided all communion with it, or if they could not, then patiently suffered for their conscience sake under the hands of tyrants, called Christians; until that tyranny growing insupportable, and that mortal contagion unavoidable, it pleased God, lest we might have been as Sodom and Gomorrah, to begin to call us thence at the time appointed unto a greater liberty, as we see this day.

“As therefore when a little gold is mixed with a great quantity of base and counterfeit metal, so that of both is made but one

mass or lump, each metal, we know, still retains its nature diverse from the other, and yet outwardly and visibly is not to be discerned the one from the other; but both are seen together as they are outwardly one, but cannot be distinguished by the eye, as they are diverse and several; the gold is visible as it is one mass, and under the same outside and figure with the rest, yet it is truly invisible as it is diverse from the rest: but when the refiner comes and severs them, then will each metal appear in his own colours, and put on his own outside, and so become visible apart from the rest: Such is the case here, and such was the state and condition of the Church in the prevailing and great apostasy; the purer metal of the visible Christian body was not outwardly discernible from the base and counterfeit, while one outside covered them, and so much the rather, because the apostate part in a great proportion exceeding the sound, made it imperceptible: but when the time of refining came, then was our Church not first founded in the true faith, (God forbid) but a part of the Christian body newly refined from such corruptions as time had gathered; even as gold refined begins not then first to be gold, though it begin but then to be refined gold.

“Whatsoever we have hitherto spoken of the state of the true believers under the apostasy of Antichrist, is the same which befel the true Israelites in the apostasy of Israel. And doth not S. Peter intimate that the apostasy which should betide Christians should be like that which we read to have befallen Israel, 2 Peter ii. 1. ? *There were (saith he) false prophets also among the people, (i.e. Israelites) even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them.* If the apostasy of Christians were to be of the same stamp with that of Israel, and the heresies brought into Christendom by the false doctors of Babylon, like unto those wherewith the false prophets of Israel infected and poisoned the ancient people of God; surely we cannot find a better pattern whereby to know what was the state and condition

of the unstained Christian believers under the apostasy of the *Man of Sin*, than that which was of the true Israelites under the apostasy of Israel. For the right understanding whereof, we must always remember that the Israelitish Church did at no time altogether renounce the true and living God, not in their worst times; but in their own conceit and profession they acknowledged him still, and were called his people, and he their God, though they worshipped others beside him: So Christians in their apostasy neither did nor were to make an absolute apostasy from God the Father and Christ their Redeemer, but in an outward profession still to acknowledge him, and to be called Christians; though by their idolatry and spiritual whoredoms they indeed denied the Lord that bought them, (i.e.) whom they profess to be their Redeemer; just as Israel for the like is said to have forsaken the Lord their God that brought them out of the land of Egypt. Here therefore the case of both is alike; let us also see the rest.

“You ask, Where was the true Church we speak of in Anti-christ’s time? I ask likewise, Where was the company of true worshippers in Ahab’s time? was it not so covered and scattered under the apostate Israelites, that Elias himself, who was one of it, could scarce find it? *I have been very jealous (saith he) for the Lord God of hosts; because the children of Israel have forsaken thy covenant, thrown down thy altars, and slain thy prophets with the sword; and I, even I alone am left, and they seek my life to take it away.* 1 Kings xix. 14. Yet the Lord tells him, ver. 18, *I have yet left me seven thousand in Israel, all the knees which have not bowed unto Baal, and every mouth which hath not kissed him.* Yet I trow these seven thousand were not outwardly severed from the rest of Israel, but remained still external members of the same visible body with them. But you will except, that the true and unstained Church of Judah was still visible and apparent. I ask you then, Where was the company of the true worshippers of Jehovah in Manasses’ time,

the worst time of all other? when the ten tribes were carried captive, and but Judah and Benjamin only left; and they, as far as the eye of man can see, wholly and generally fallen from the Lord their God to all manner of idols and idolatries, like unto the abominations of the Heathen, whom the Lord had cast out before the children of Israel: when in the temple itself, the only place where the true God was legally to be worshipped, were idolatrous altars erected, even in the house whereof the Lord had said, *in this house and in Jerusalem will I put my name for ever*; even in this house, this holy house, were idols and graven images erected, and in both courts thereof altars to Baalim, the sun, the moon, and the whole host of heaven, the like whereof never had been until that time. Besides, who is able to name the man for almost fifty years together that remained a faithful servant and true worshipper of the living God in the midst of this hideous profanation? Nor is it easy to be conceived, how it was possible all that time to offer any legal sacrifice without idolatry, when God's own temple and house was made a den of idols; nay his altar, the only altar of Israel, destroyed, to make room for altars erected to idols; as may be gathered 2 Chron. xxxiii. 15, 16. Where was the true Church of Israel now? or had the Lord no Church at all? Yes, certainly, he had a Church, and a company which defiled not their garments; a company (I say) but not visibly distinguished from the rest of their nation, but hidden as it were in the midst of that apostate body, and yet known together with the rest to be Israelites and people of Jehovah; but known to God alone and themselves to be true Israelites and faithful servants to Jehovah their God. And that such a company there was, and a strong party too, though not seen, appeared presently upon the death of Manasses and his wicked son, when Josiah began to reign at eight years of age. For they then prevailed even in the court itself, and so brought up the king, that even while he was yet young, in the eighth year of his reign, he began to seek after the God of David his father, and in the

twelfth year to make a public and powerful reformation, such as the like was never done before him. Could all this have been done so soon, and by a king so young in years, and to carry all before it like a torrent, unless there had been a strong party, which now having a king for them, began quickly to shew themselves and to sway the state, though before they were hardly to be seen?

“When therefore our adversaries ask us where our Church was before Luther, we see by this what we have to answer.”—Page 800 to 803.

Ch. XI. The preceding chapters, which constitute the most important part of this valuable treatise, having with the quotations occupied so much space, I must condense the remainder into as small a compass as possible.

Having fully discussed the two first particulars in his division of the subject, the learned Author now comes to the third, viz. the specification of the time when this apostasy was to prevail. He analyzes various forms of expression made use of in scripture to designate periods of time. From his analysis he deduces the conclusion, “that as the *last times* in general were the times wherein Christ the Sun of Righteousness was to be revealed, and his kingdom founded in the world; so the *latter times* of these *last times* should be the times wherein the apostasy of the Christian faith should prevail, and *that Wicked One* usurp the throne of Christ.”

Ch. XII. An exact account is given in this chapter of what is meant by the *last times* generally, and the *latter times* specially. For the purpose of accurately defining these two important periods, one of which includes the other, the Author has recourse to “that sacred CALENDAR AND GREAT ALMANAC OF PROPHECY, the four kingdoms of Daniel; which are a prophetic chronology of times measured by the succession of four principal kingdoms, from the beginning of the captivity of Israel, until the mystery of God should be finished.” These kingdoms are, 1. The Babylonian. 2. The Medo-Persian. 3. The Grecian

or Macedonian. 4. The Roman. Of this quarterary, as the Roman, being the last of the four, is the last kingdom; so the period of its existence constitutes the *last times*. It was within the limits of this period, viz., in the *last times*, or in the times of the last kingdom, (viz., the Roman) that the Lord Jesus Christ was to establish his spiritual kingdom in the world,—*Who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these LAST TIMES*. 1 Peter i. 20.

If, then, as it has been fully demonstrated, the *last times*, in general, designate all the time of the fourth kingdom, the *latter times*, being a portion of the former, must necessarily be the *latter times* of that kingdom. They constitute a period precisely corresponding with the *time and times, and the dividing of time* of the prophet Daniel, (ch. vii.) during which, *the little horn with eyes like a man, and a mouth speaking great things, should make war with the saints, prevail against them, and wear them out, and think to change times and laws, until the judgment should sit, and his dominion be taken away*.

Ch. XIII. This chapter is devoted to two subjects of investigation, viz., first, the duration of the *latter times*; and, secondly, their commencement. With regard to the first, the learned Author shews that the various designations of this period, such as *time and times, and the dividing of time, forty and two months, a thousand two hundred and threescore days*, must be understood, not literally, but symbolically. His reasons for so interpreting them are stated more fully in chap. ix., p. 742. of “Remains on some passages in the Apocalypse.” But they are summarily mentioned in the following extract, which I shall insert at length, not only on account of the importance of the subject, but, also, because this is another very material point in which the Oxford Tract Writers symbolize with the “Adversaries,” spoken of by Mede.

In reference to this question, he says:—“Our Adversaries would have them literally understood for three single years and a

half, as though it were an history, and not a prophecy : but besides the use of prophecy to reckon days for years, I think it would trouble any man to conceive how so many things as should be performed in this time should be done in three single years and a half. 1. Ten kingdoms founded at the same time with the beast. 2. Peoples, and multitudes of nations and tongues to serve and obey him. 3. To make war with the saints and overcome them. 4. To cause all that dwell upon the earth to worship him. 5. Babylon to ride the beast so long, that all nations shall drink of the wine of her fornication, all the kings of the earth commit fornication with her, yea the merchants and all those that had ships in the sea to grow rich by trading with her. Methinks all these things should ask much more than three years' work or four either. To which I add moreover, that the king, state of government, sovereignty, or seigniory, or what you will, of the beast, under which the whore should ride him, followeth immediately upon a former, which in comparison is said to continue but a short space, Rev. xvii. 10. But if the Antichristian state shall continue but three years and a half literally taken, how short must the time of that foregoing king or sovereignty be, which should occasion the Holy Ghost to insert so singular a note of the difference thereof from that which followed, *That it should continue but a short space?* Doth not this imply, that the next state (wherein the whore should ride the beast) was to continue a long space? Therefore three years and a half, historically taken, cannot be the time of the Church's apostasy and the Antichristian sovereignty of Rome : and if it cannot be taken historically, it must be taken prophetically, every day for a year ; and so 1260 days counted so many years shews the extent of these ὅσπου καιροὶ to be 1260 years."—P. 809.

Having determined the duration of the apostasy, he prosecutes his enquiry relative to its commencement. By quotations from the Fathers, and, especially by a remarkable one from Jerome, he shews that they generally, if not universally, expected the downfal

of the Cæsarean or Imperial sovereignty of Rome, and the partition of the empire into ten kingdoms to precede the germination of the *little horn* of Daniel, and the revelation of the *Man of Sin*, and of Antichrist, each of which is included in the apostasy of the *latter times*, or may be considered as identical with it. The conclusion which he finally deduces from his arguments and authorities, I will subjoin in his own words:—"It is apparent by all that hath been said, that these *ὑστεροὶ καιροὶ latter times*, with that wicked sovereignty which should domineer in them, were to take beginning from the wound, the fall, the ruin, the rending in pieces or rooting up of the Imperial sovereignty of the city of Rome. When that city should cease to be the lap of that sovereignty which the Cæsars once held over the nations, and many new upstart kings should appear in the place and territory of that once-one empire; then should the apostasy be seen, and the *latter times* with that *Wicked One* make their entrance. Now in what age this fell out, I think no man can be ignorant who hath but a little skill in history."—P. 811.

As the learned Author in the following chapter gives a specification of dates, in which the event has shewn that he, like many other interpreters of the prophetic Scriptures, has been mistaken, I shall pass it over, and come to the 15th., which, being a digression, will not require much notice. The object of it is to shew that, when St. Paul speaks of *the day approaching*, (Heb. x. 25.) St. Peter of *the end of all things*, (1 Pet. iv. 7.) St. John of *the last time*, (1 John ii. 18.) they do not refer to the consummation of all things, as if they imagined that it were at hand; but they allude to the approaching end of the Jewish polity or commonwealth, which was to take place at the impending destruction of their city and temple.

The sixteenth and seventeenth chapters relate to the fourth particular of the first division of the Author's treatise, viz., "The proof or warrant of this prophecy:—it is that which the Spirit hath long ago foretold *ῥητῶς* in the written word, verbatim, totidem verbis, or, in express words."

In these chapters I am reluctantly compelled to dissent from an Author whose writings on the subject of prophecy are generally, as we have seen, from Bishop Hurd, peculiarly entitled to attention. He is of opinion that by the term *expressly*, or *in express words*, we are taught to look for a prophecy which had already been delivered in the Old Testament; and this prophecy, according to him, is to be found in Dan. xi. 36—39. But I must confess that I concur with Whitby in thinking that by the term in question nothing more was meant than “clearly,” “perspicuously.” This apostasy or defection from the purity of the faith, which was to arise in *the latter times* in the Christian Church was not predicted in the usually figurative and symbolical language of prophecy; but was revealed to the Apostle in such literal and unambiguous terms, and was characterized by such peculiar traits that, it should seem, the parties, who were to be implicated in it, could be mistaken by no one who gave any attention to the subject, or considered it with any degree of impartiality. This construction of the word is, in my opinion, abundantly confirmed by the Author himself in the second part of his treatise, of which a succinct view must now be taken.

PART II.

CH. I. According to the division of the subject given in the beginning of this treatise, the Author proposed to investigate the means which, according to the tenor of the prophecy, were to be employed for the introduction and furtherance of this defection, which include, “1. The manner or method used, viz., by *lying hypocrisy*, or *hypocritical lying*. 2. The quality or description of the authors and furtherers thereof, they should be such as *had their consciences seared, who forbade marriages and meats*.” From the manner in which he has conducted the discussion in this last part, his scheme might, perhaps, have been more briefly and accurately stated thus: 1. The character of the authors and promoters of the apostasy. 2. An account of the means which

they employed for the furtherance of their object. This first chapter, however, contains nothing more than a repetition, with some additions, of the reasons assigned by the Author in the first chapter of the first part, which induced him to deviate from the received translation of the passage.

Ch. II. The introductory paragraph of this chapter must here be given without any abridgment, not only on account of the elucidation which it furnishes of that portion of prophetic writings which forms the subject of this treatise; but also on account of the concluding remark made by the Author:—"Now, for the unfolding of the words, this must first be observed in general, that they are not to be so understood, as if those who are the bringers in and advancers of the doctrine of dæmons should every one of them be guilty of all the several imputations in this description. But they are to be construed rather as an asyndeton, by understanding the conjunction, as if it had been uttered thus: *Through the hypocrisy of liars, and, through the hypocrisy of men of seared consciences, and lastly, through the hypocrisy of those who forbid marriage and meats*; or thus: *Through the hypocrisy, partly of liars, partly of men of seared consciences, partly of those who forbid marriage and command to abstain from meats*; that so, though many were guilty of all, yet some may be exempt from some; as, namely, some might be guilty of the last note, of *forbidding marriage and abstaining from meats*, and yet free of the former, of *being counterfeit liars and men of seared consciences*: WHICH I SPEAK FOR REVERENCE OF SOME OF THE ANCIENTS, WHO, THOUGH OTHERWISE HOLY MEN, YET CANNOT BE ACQUITTED FROM ALL THE IMPUTATIONS HERE MENTIONED, NOR ALTOGETHER EXCUSED FROM HAVING AN HAND, THROUGH THE FATE OF THE TIMES WHEREIN THEY LIVED, IN LAYING THE GROUND-WORK WHEREON SOON AFTER THE GREAT APOSTASY WAS BUILDED."—P. 834.

It is afterwards observed by the Author, with reference to the *hypocrisy* which was to be the pervading principle of the apostasy

of the latter times, that "all should be counterfeit;—*lying* should carry the counterfeit of truth,—*the seared conscience* a semblance of devotion,—*the restraint of marriage* should be but a shew of chastity,—and *abstaining from meats* a false appearance of abstinence." Let the intelligent reader say, whether some of the corruptions of the Church of Rome, as they have been pourtrayed by the pen of history, could be more forcibly or faithfully delineated than in these few words !

The learned Writer proceeds to state his opinion, (the correctness of which cannot, I think, be impugned) that the *hypocrisy of liars*, here mentioned by St. Paul, refers to the same system of fraud and deception as that of which he speaks in 2 Thess. ii., "where he tells us, that the coming of the *Man of Sin* and the apostasy attending him *should be after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness, or unrighteous and ungodly deceiving*; and that *God should send them strong delusions, that they might believe a lie, &c.*"

He then exemplifies the *hypocrisy of liars* in three particulars, viz.: "1. Lies of miracles; 2. Fabulous legends of the acts of saints and sufferings of martyrs; 3. Counterfeit writings under the name of the best and first antiquity." Under the first head, he observes that lies of miracles display the hypocrisy of their fabricators in three particulars, viz.: 1. Forgery; 2. Illusion; 3. Misapplication, meaning by this last term, the fraud or fanaticism which induced men either to ascribe to a divine agency that which was nothing more than *the working of Satan*, or to invent fabulous narratives for the confirmation of others in some idolatrous errors. The Author justly remarks, that any persons who could resort to such expedients as these, for the promotion even of the best of causes, must have had their consciences *seared with a hot iron*, or, according to the expressive meaning of the original term, rendered callous by the process of cauterization.

Ch. III. In this chapter it is shewn that the *hypocrisy of liars*

was specially employed in forging lies of miracles for the introduction and advancement of the worship of saints and their relics,—a corruption of Christianity which was unknown in the Church during the three first centuries. In the conclusion of it the Author adduces evidence to prove that “the idolatry of saint-worship was a true counterfeit of the Gentiles’ idolatry of dæmons; and was promoted by *signs and lying wonders* of a similar description.”

Ch. IV. Extracts are here given from the works of Gregory of Tours, a Latin author of the sixth century, and of Simeon Metaphrastes, a Greek author of the tenth century, to prove that the fabulous legends of the acts of saints and martyrs were invented for the purpose of advancing the doctrines of dæmons, or, in other words, the idolatrous worship of canonized saints. Mede says that the former writer concludes the first of two books on the miracles of the martyrs in this manner,—“It behoves us, therefore, to desire the patronage of the martyrs, that so we may merit through their suffrages, and by their intercession obtain that which we are not worthy of upon the account of our own merits;” and the second thus,—“And, therefore, let the reader, well considering these miracles, understand that there is no possibility for him to be saved but by the help of martyrs, and other friends of God.”

The learned Author’s quotations from Simeon Metaphrastes are more numerous. Let the following be taken as a specimen. It is an account of the prayer of a saint of the name of Marina, who suffered martyrdom under Diocletian, together with the answer, which, according to this inventor and chronicler of legends, it received.—“And now, O Lord my God, whosoever for thy sake shall worship this tabernacle of my body, which hath fought for thee, and whosoever shall build an oratory in the name of thy handmaid, and shall therein offer unto thee spiritual sacrifices, oblations, and prayers, and all those who shall faithfully describe this my conflict of martyrdom, and shall read and remember the name of thy handmaid; give unto them, most holy Lord, who art

a lover of the good and a friend of souls, remission of sins ; and grant them propitiation and mercy, according to the measure of their faith ; and let not the revenging hand come near them, nor the evil of famine, nor the curse of pestilence, nor any grievous scourge ; nor let any other incurable destruction either of body or soul betide them. And to all those who shall in faith and truth adhere to my house (or oratory or chapel) or unto my name, and shall unto thee, O Lord, offer glory, and praise, and a sacrifice in remembrance of thine handmaid, and shall ask salvation and mercy through me ; grant them, O Lord, abundant store of all good things : for thou alone art good and gracious, and the giver of all good things for ever and ever. Amen.

“ While she was thus praying with herself, (saith Simeon,) behold there was a great earthquake, &c. yea and the Lord himself, with a multitude and host of holy angels standing by her, in such sort as was perceptible to the understanding, said, ‘ Be of good cheer, Marina, and fear not, for I have heard thy prayers, and have fulfilled, and will in due time fulfil whatsoever thou hast asked, even as thou hast asked it.’—P. 842.

The manner in which men of cauterized consciences succeeded in diffusing this dæmonolatry—this idolatrous veneration of saints and relics by their fabulous narratives and *lying hypocrisies*, may here be appositely illustrated by the account which Mosheim gives of the state of religion during the two periods in which Gregory of Tours and Simeon Metaphrastes respectively lived, viz. in the sixth and tenth centuries. Of the former he says,—“ When once the ministers of the Church had departed from the ancient simplicity of religious worship, and sullied the native purity of divine truth by a motley mixture of human inventions, it was difficult to set bounds to this growing corruption. Abuses were daily multiplied, and superstition drew from its horrid fecundity an incredible number of absurdities, which were added to the doctrine of Christ and his Apostles. The controversial writers in the eastern provinces continued to render perplexed and

obscure some of the principal doctrines of Christianity, by the subtle distinctions which they borrowed from a vain and chimerical philosophy. The public teachers and instructors of the people degenerated sadly from the apostolic character. They seemed to aim at nothing else than to sink the multitude into the most opprobrious ignorance and superstition, to efface in their minds all sense of the beauty and excellence of genuine piety, and to substitute, in the place of religious principles, a blind veneration for the clergy, and a stupid zeal for a senseless round of ridiculous rites and ceremonies. This, perhaps, will appear less surprising, when we consider, that the blind led the blind; for the public ministers and teachers of religion were, for the most part, grossly ignorant; nay, almost as much so as the multitude whom they were appointed to instruct.

“To be convinced of the truth of the dismal representation we have here given of the state of religion at this time, nothing more is necessary than to cast an eye upon the doctrines now taught concerning the worship of images and saints, the fire of purgatory, the efficacy of good works, i.e. the observance of human rites and institutions, towards the attainment of salvation, the power of relics to heal the diseases of body and mind; and such like sordid and miserable fancies, which are inculcated in many of the superstitious productions of this century, and particularly in the epistles and other writings of Gregory the Great. Nothing more ridiculous on the one hand, than the solemnity and liberality with which this good, but silly, pontif distributed the wonder-working relics; and nothing more lamentable on the other, than the stupid eagerness and devotion with which the deluded multitude received them, and suffered themselves to be persuaded, that a portion of stinking oil, taken from the lamps which burned at the tombs of the martyrs, had a supernatural efficacy to sanctify its possessors, and to defend them from all dangers both of a temporal and spiritual nature.”—Mosheim’s Ecclesiastical History, vol. i. p. 452.

This is the account which Mosheim gives us of the latter,—
 “The state of religion in this century was such as might be expected in times of prevailing ignorance and corruption. The most important doctrines of Christianity were disfigured and perverted in the most wretched manner, and such as had preserved, in unskilful hands, their primitive purity, were nevertheless obscured with a multitude of vain opinions and idle fancies, so that their intrinsic excellence and lustre were little attended to; all this will appear evident to those who look with the smallest degree of attention into the writers of this age. Both Greeks and Latins placed the essence and life of religion in the worship of images and departed saints, in searching after with zeal, and preserving with a devout care and veneration, the sacred relics of holy men and women, and in accumulating riches upon the priests and monks, whose opulence increased with the progress of superstition. Scarcely did any Christian dare to approach the throne of God, without rendering first the saints and images propitious by a solemn round of expiatory rites and lustrations. The ardour also with which relics were sought, surpasses almost all credibility; it had seized all ranks and orders among the people, and was grown into a sort of fanaticism and frenzy; and, if the monks are to be believed, the supreme Being interposed, in an especial and extraordinary manner, to discover to doating old wives and bare-headed friars the place where the bones or carcasses of the saints lay dispersed or interred. The fears of purgatory, of that fire which was to destroy the remaining impurities of departed souls, were now carried to the greatest height, and exceeded by far the terrifying apprehensions of eternal torments; for they hoped to avoid the latter easily, by dying enriched with the prayers of the clergy, or covered with the merits or mediation of the saints; while from the pains of purgatory they knew there was no exemption. The clergy, therefore, finding these superstitious terrors admirably adapted to increase their authority and to promote their interest, used every method to augment them, and by

the most pathetic discourses, accompanied with monstrous fables and fictitious miracles, they laboured to establish the doctrine of purgatory, and also to make it appear that they had a mighty influence in that formidable region.”—Mosheim’s *Ecclesiastical History*, vol. ii. p. 214.

To these I will add a third extract from the same ecclesiastical writer, describing the rapid progress of the apostasy or defection from the purity of the gospel, even so early as the fifth century. The three passages taken together, and combined with the various authorities cited by Mede and Sir Isaac Newton, constitute such a mass of evidence, in support of the argument pursued in this treatise, as no ingenuity can overturn, or sophistry evade.—“If, before this time, the lustre of religion was clouded with superstition, and its divine precepts adulterated with a mixture of human inventions, this evil, instead of decreasing, increased daily. The happy souls of departed Christians were invoked by numbers, and their aid implored by assiduous and fervent prayers; while none stood up to censure or oppose this preposterous worship. The question, how the prayers of mortals ascended to the celestial spirits (a question which afterwards produced much wrangling and many idle fancies) did not as yet occasion any difficulty. For the Christians of this century did not imagine that the souls of the saints were so entirely confined to the celestial mansions, as to be deprived of the privilege of visiting mortals, and travelling, when they pleased, through various countries. They were further of opinion, that the places most frequented by departed spirits were those where the bodies they had formerly animated were interred; and this opinion, which the Christians borrowed from the Greeks and Romans, rendered the sepulchres of the saints the great rendezvous of suppliant multitudes. The images of those, who, during their lives, had acquired the reputation of uncommon sanctity, were now honoured with a particular worship in several places; and many imagined, that this worship drew down into the images the propitious presence of the saints

or celestial beings they represented ; deluded, perhaps, into this idle fancy by the crafty fictions of the heathen priests, who had published the same thing concerning the statues of Jupiter and Mercury. A singular and irresistible efficacy was also attributed to the bones of martyrs, and to the figure of the cross, in defeating the attempts of Satan, removing all sorts of calamities, and in healing not only the diseases of the body, but also those of the mind. We shall not enter here into a particular account of the public supplications, the holy pilgrimages, the superstitious services paid to departed souls, the multiplication of temples, altars, penitential garments, and a multitude of other circumstances, that shewed the decline of genuine piety, and the corrupt darkness that was eclipsing the lustre of primitive Christianity. As there were none in these times to hinder the Christians from retaining the opinions of their Pagan ancestors concerning departed souls, heroes, dæmons, temples, and such like matters, and even transferring them into their religious services ; and as, instead of entirely abolishing the rites and institutions of ancient times, these institutions were still observed with only some slight alterations ; all this swelled of necessity the torrent of superstition, and deformed the beauty of the Christian religion and worship with those corrupt remains of paganism, which still subsist in a certain Church.

“ It will not be improper to observe here, that the famous Pagan doctrine, concerning the purification of departed souls, by means of a certain kind of fire, was more amply explained and confirmed now than it had formerly been. Every body knows, that this doctrine proved an inexhaustible source of riches to the clergy through the succeeding ages, and that it still enriches the Romish Church with its nutritious streams.”—Mosheim’s Ecclesiastical History, vol. i. p. 382.

Ch. V. As this chapter contains a digression concerning the times in which Simeon the Metaphrast lived, and the occasion of his writing ; and as it affects the main argument of the treatise only *ex abundanti*, I shall pass it over.

Ch. VI. With regard to this short chapter, it will be sufficient to quote the beginning. This, however, is both curious and important when compared with the following passage in Froude's Remains; not only because it demonstrates that the learned Joseph Mede took a different view of some of the ancient liturgies from Mr. Palmer; but also, because it manifests an identity of taste and sentiments between the partisans of the Oxford Tract system and the Romanists, which could scarcely have been imagined.—“What captivated —— at first was a kind of warm, affectionate manner in Perceval's writing, which I am afraid he had desiderated in my conversation. For a long time he looked on me as a mere sophister, but P. conciliated his affections with Palmer's chapter on the Primitive Liturgies, and I verily believe that he would now gladly consent to see our communion service replaced by a good translation of the liturgy of St. Peter; a name which I advise you to substitute in your notes to —— for the obnoxious phrase ‘MASS BOOK.’”—Froude's Remains, vol. i. p. 387.

Let the reader now contrast the foregoing with what follows from Joseph Mede,—“The last particular of *ὑπόκρισις ψευδολόγων*, *The hypocrisy of liars*, I made to be counterfeit writings under the names of the first and best antiquity; S. Peter's liturgy, the liturgy of S. James, of Matthew, of Mark, the Apostle's Council at Antioch; foisted works under the names of Justin, Origen, Cyprian, Athanasius, and others. Through which we need not doubt but the doctrine of dæmons was promoted, when we see some not ashamed still to maintain it by these counterfeit authorities.

“Thus you see how the first-born and the most ancient part of the doctrine of dæmons, the deifying of saints and martyrs, was advanced by the hypocrisy of liars. The same you shall find to have been verified also in the advancing of the next-born dæmon-changeling, image-worship, and of the third, the idolatry of the Mass-god; all brought in and established by the means and ways

aforenamed. I need not spend time in historical allegations, they are well enough known; and *primum in unoquoque genere est mensura consequentium*; by that I spake of the first, you may judge of those which follow: yet for images, I will tell you a story or two for a taste.

"Bale, our countryman, (Script. Illust. Britan. cent. i. c. 91, 99,) relates, that about the year 712, one Egwin of Worcester published in writing certain revelations, yea express visions he had seen, wherein he was enjoined to set up in his Diocese of Worcester the image of the blessed Virgin for the people to worship; which Pope Constantine the First having made him confirm by oath, not only ratified by his bull, but caused Brithwald, the archbishop, to hold a council of the whole clergy at London, to commend them to the people."—P. 847.

Ch. VII. The learned Author has now conducted his readers to the last clause of this remarkable prophecy. The *doctrine of demons* was to be advanced, finally, "through the hypocrisy of such as forbid marriage, and command to abstain from meats." It is the hypothesis of the Author, for the truth of which he brings the most satisfactory evidence in the next chapter, that this prediction has a peculiar reference to monks and the various monastic orders. The prohibition of marriage was an invariable concomitant of monkery long before the secular clergy were interdicted from it: and Joseph Mede displays his usual acumen and exact knowledge of the sacred volume by shewing that the word here translated *meats*, (*βρωμάρτων*) is sometimes taken in scripture to denote generally "maintenance, revenue, estate, possession." From which he deduces this conclusion, viz. "that these words are a description of monkery by such notes as are fundamental, which way soever we take them;—either containing single life and discrimen ciborum the differencing of meats, or the two vows of chastity and poverty,—or all three of them, chastity, poverty, and abstaining from meats. As for that other vow of obedience, it was not from the beginning, nor common to all; not to Erem-

ites and Anchqrites, but such as lived in common under a head. And these are the men through whose hypocrisy and by whose means the doctrine of dæmons should be brought in and advanced among Christians *in the latter times.*"

Ch. VIII. The learned Author begins this concluding chapter with observing that the monastic life and saint-worship were nearly contemporaneous in their rise. He then proceeds to adduce his authorities for ascribing the first introduction of the "adoring of relics and invocation of saints" to the monastic Orders. One authority which he cites is that of Martin Chemnitz, the celebrated author of the "*Examen Concilii Tridentini.*" This authority, be it observed, is in complete accordance with the extracts which have already been given in this article from Sir Isaac Newton's work on the prophecies. This is the testimony of Chemnitz,—“By Basil, Nyssen, and Nazianzen, upon panegyric orations, invocation of saints began to be brought into the public assemblies of the Church, at the same time when by the same authors the profession of monastical life was brought out of Egypt and Syria into Greece ;—and it seems (saith he) that this was either a part or an appurtenance of monkery.” Again, speaking of Ambrose, when he had embraced monasticism,—“I deny not (saith he) but Ambrose at length, when he had once borrowed monkery from Basil, began also to incline to the invocation of saints, as appears in his book *de viduis.*” Afterwards Joseph Mede remarks that, “though it must not be denied but God had some of this order which were holy men and unfeignedly mortified, notwithstanding their error in thinking God was pleased with that singularity of life ; yet must it be confessed that the greater part were no better than hypocrites and counterfeits, and that the lamentable defection of the Christian Church chiefly proceeded from and was fostered by men of that profession, as we have heard already.”

The whole treatise is thus concluded by the learned Author.—“For the idolatry of the Mass, which was not in use, at the

soonest, till a thousand years after Christ, (when the opinion of transubstantiation had gotten sufficient strength) we shall not need trouble ourselves much to shew that monks and friars were the authors and advancers thereof, since by that time these kind of men were become the only masters of divinity; and, therefore, we doubt not but what was then broached in the Church came out of their shops. Judge, now, by what you have heard, how truly this prophecy of St. Paul is fulfilled, who told us—that *the doctrines of dæmons* should be brought into the Church, *through the hypocrisy of those who forbid to marry, and command to abstain from meats.*”

If I have unhappily failed in my attempt to convey to the reader a clear view of the line of argument which is pursued in this valuable treatise, I hope that he will be induced to consult the original work for himself. If the latter, attentively pursued, fail to carry conviction to his mind, I can only say that his perceptions of the weight of evidence must differ very widely from my own. As far as I can judge, it amounts, in the present instance, to nothing short of moral demonstration.

I will conclude this long article with an extract from the writings of a pious and learned divine, Dr. Henry More, who was a Fellow of the same College with Joseph Mede, and nearly his contemporary,—the latter having been born in the year 1586, and the former in the year 1614. Alluding to the passage which Mede has himself given from Epiphanius, Dr. More says,—“Wherefore it is plain from this exposition of Epiphanius that this prediction of St. Paul is very applicable to the apostasy of the Church of Rome for giving divine honour to the saints, which is apparently νεκροῖς λατρεῖν to give religious worship to the dead. Which will still be found more exquisitely to fit them of Rome, if we consider by what external means this dæmon-worship is promoted. For these that are said to depart from the faith, that is, from the sound doctrine of it, as Epiphanius interpreted it, and to apostatize into the idolatrous worship of dæmons,

are said to do this, *through the hypocrisy of tellers of lies*, (the Apocalypse calls them,—*those that make lies*,) that is to say, that feign legends of the miracles of their saints, or dæmons, or souls of the departed : and, indeed, do it so impudently, as if they made no conscience of those pious frauds and fables ; whence it is said that they have their *consciences seared with a hot iron*. What can be more expressive of the Greek and Roman legends than this ?—And yet there is still a more particular character added, *forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats*. Whom can this character fit so well as the Orders of Monks, into whose societies no man could be admitted but upon strict observation of these laws ? They prohibited any one who would be of their fraternity to marry, and enjoined them also to abstain from certain meats. These things are so solidly and copiously made out in Mr. Mede's '*apostasy of the latter times*,' that I need add nothing more than a recommendation of that treatise to the reader. There is scarce any prophecy falls more fitly upon any event than this does upon the Church in those times when she had lapsed into this dæmon-worship by the seduction of a fraudulent and superstitious clergy."—Dr. Henry More's *Theological Works*, b. ii. c. x. p. 652.

No. 4.

IN my last Charge (p. 17) I have distinctly admitted the claim of the ancient Fathers of the Church upon our gratitude and veneration. In the Appendix also (p. 130) I have observed that "the great point upon which it is scarcely possible to overrate the value of the writings of the Fathers is—their testimony to the genuineness and authenticity of the canonical books of the New Testament, and to the fundamental doctrines contained in the three creeds." Where there is so much to admire, and so much to command respect, it is a painful and invidious task to detect and expose errors, which have greatly tended to adulterate the

purity of the Christian faith. But this task, irksome as it is, must be encountered, when an attempt is made to attach an undue authority to the Fathers as interpreters of scripture, and in the same proportion to depreciate that of the Reformers. Those who are most conversant with the writings of the Reformers, and compare them with the numerous quotations which have been given in the preceding article from those of the ancient Fathers, if their minds be not deeply tainted with the leaven of the Oxford Tract system, cannot avoid coming to the conclusion that, while the latter built upon the right foundation much that might be denominated *wood, hay, stubble*; the former, upon the same foundation, built *gold, silver, precious stones*. This conclusion will, if I mistake not, be corroborated by some further extracts which I am about to make in this number from the Catechetical Lectures of Cyril, Archbishop of Jerusalem.

That Cyril contributed his share towards the introduction of the "apostasy of the latter times," has already appeared from passages which have been cited from his lectures in the beginning of the Charge. To these I will add some further quotations—partly relating to the same subjects as before—and partly to others of a different nature.

The opinion entertained by this ancient Father of the transcendent excellency of the celibate, and of its superiority to the conjugal state, is evinced by the following question which occurs at p. 53. "When will a young woman choose a virgin life, or a young man be sober-minded, unless they believe that chastity has a crown unfading?" At p. 77, he speaks of "the angelical rank of a virgin life." Again, at p. 140, he observes,—“Also let the Order of Solitaries understand the renown of chastity; for we too are allowed the same dignity.” But what can more strikingly exhibit his views of the pre-eminent merit of the state of celibacy than the following climax?—"Every prayer of thine, every psalm thou singest, is recorded; every alms-deed, every fast is recorded; every marriage duly observed is recorded; continence kept

for God's sake is recorded ; but the first crowns in record are those of virginity and purity ; and thou shalt shine as an angel."
—P. 197.

The superstition and credulity of the ancient Fathers may be exemplified by the following instances. In the fourth lecture, "on the ten points of faith," Cyril, speaking of our blessed Lord, (p. 38) says,—“He was crucified for our sins truly : shouldst thou be disposed to deny it, the very place which all can see refutes thee, even this blessed Golgotha, in which, on account of him who was crucified on it, we are now assembled : and further, the whole world is filled with the portions of the wood of the cross.” Again, to the same effect, at p. 144, “For though I should now deny it,” (viz. the real crucifixion of our Lord,) “this Golgotha confutes me near which we are now assembled ; the wood of the cross confutes me, which has from hence been distributed piecemeal to all the world ;” so also at p. 108, “The holy wood of the cross is his witness, which is seen among us at this day, and by means of those who have in faith taken thereof, has from this place now almost filled the whole earth.”

In the preceding extracts we may notice that some sanction is given to the superstitious reverence paid to relics by the members of the Church of Rome. In the following instance, a precedent is established for the dissemination of spurious miracles.—Having in the foregoing section made mention of the blasphemies of Simon Magus, Cyril proceeds to say,—“The error spreading, that goodly pair, Peter and Paul, the rulers of the Church, being present, set matters right again ; and on Simon, the supposed God, attempting a display, they straightway laid him dead. Simon, that is, promised that he should be raised aloft towards heaven, and accordingly was borne through the air on a chariot of dæmons ; on which the servants of God falling on their knees, gave an instance of that agreement, of which Jesus said, *‘If two of you shall agree as touching any thing that they shall ask, it shall be done for them :* and reaching the sorcerer with this

unanimity of their prayer, they precipitated him to the earth.”—
P. 68.

But I grieve to say that the blindest votary of the Church of Rome could scarcely ascribe greater efficacy to any superstitious rite of purely human invention than is done by Cyril to the application of exorcised oil to the baptized person in the administration of baptism. In his twentieth lecture, “on the rites of baptism,” he thus addresses those who had been baptized,—“Then, when ye were stripped, ye were anointed with exorcised oil, from the very hairs of your head to your feet, and were made partakers of the good olive-tree, Jesus Christ. For ye were cut off from the wild olive-tree, and grafted into the good one, and were made to share the fatness of the true olive-tree. The exorcised oil, therefore, was a symbol of the participation of the fatness of Christ, the charm to drive away every trace of hostile influence. For as the breathing of the saints, and the invocation of the name of God, like fiercest flame scorch and drive out evil spirits, so also this exorcised oil receives such virtue by the invocation of God and by prayer, as not only to burn and cleanse away the traces of sins, but also to chase away all the invisible powers of the evil one.”

Moreover, in his lecture “on the body and blood of Christ,” his views bear a much closer affinity to the Popish doctrine of transubstantiation, than to the Protestant doctrine of our Church, which affirms, that after consecration, “the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances.” Let the reader judge whether the following quotations do not fully substantiate the truth of this allegation.—“He once turned water into wine in Cana of Galilee, at his own will, and is it incredible that he should have turned wine into blood? That wonderful work he miraculously wrought, when called to an earthly marriage; and shall he not much rather be acknowledged to have bestowed the fruition of his body and blood on the children of the bride-chamber? * * * * * Contemplate, therefore,

the bread and wine not as bare elements, for they are, according to the Lord's declaration, the body and blood of Christ; for though sense suggests this to thee, let faith establish thee. Judge not the matter from taste, but from faith be fully assured without misgiving, that thou hast been vouchsafed the body and blood of Christ."—Lecture xxii. s. 2, 6. Here it may be remarked that, in the second section, the credibility of the conversion of wine into blood, is attested by the miraculous conversion of water into wine at the marriage feast in Cana of Galilee. According to Cyril, therefore, if there was a real transubstantiation in the former case; there must be the same in the latter.

Before I introduce to the reader's notice the concluding quotations which I am about to give from Cyril's Catechetical Lectures, I will here remind him that it has been most justly observed by the Editors of Froude's Remains, that "the great point of giving men divine knowledge, and introducing holy associations, not indiscriminately, but as men are able to bear it," is one of those topics, with regard to which "the tone of the fourth century is, generally speaking, so unlike that of the sixteenth, that it is absolutely impossible for the same mind to sympathize with both." The truth of this observation will be verified by the following extracts relative to the principle of reserve in the communication of religious knowledge, compared with the one which has been already given in the beginning of the Charge. That those to whom Protestantism is "odious,"—whether they be Romanists, or such as symbolize with Romanism,—should find the tone of the fourth century upon this topic, as well as others, more congenial with their own tastes, sentiments, and prepossessions than that of the sixteenth, is perfectly in accordance with what might be anticipated: for surely there is a wide and essential dissimilarity between them. As little, in my opinion, can it be doubted which system is most in harmony with the revealed will of God.

"Now when the catechising has taken place, should a Catechumen ask, what the teachers have said, tell nothing to a stranger ;

for we deliver to thee a mystery, even the hope of the life to come: keep the mystery for him who pays thee. Let no man say to thee,—what harm if I also know it? So the sick ask for wine; but if it be unreasonably given them, it occasions delirium, and two evils follow; the sick man dies, and the physician gets an ill name. Thus it is with the Catechumen also if he should hear from the believer: the Catechumen is made delirious, for not understanding what he has heard, he finds fault with it, and scoffs at it, and the believer bears the blame of a betrayer. But now thou art standing on the frontiers; see thou let out nothing; not that the things spoken do not deserve telling, but the ear that hears does not deserve receiving. Thou thyself wast once a Catechumen, and then I told thee not what was coming. When thou hast by practice reached the height of what is taught thee, then wilt thou understand that the Catechumens are unworthy to hear them.”—Introductory Lecture, s. 12.

“TO THE READER.

These Catechetical Lectures thou mayest put into the hands of candidates for baptism and of baptized believers, but by no means of Catechumens, nor of any others who are not Christians; as thou shalt answer to the Lord. And if thou takest a copy of them, write this in the beginning, as in the sight of the Lord.”—Introductory Lecture. Finis.

“For since all cannot read the scripture, but some as being unlearned, others by business, are hindered from the knowledge of them; in order that the soul may not perish for lack of instruction, in the articles which are few we comprehend the whole doctrine of the faith. This I wish you to remember even in the very phrase, and to rehearse it with all diligence among yourselves, not writing it on paper, but by memory graving it on your heart, as on a monument: being watchful, during your exercise, lest haply some of the Catechumens overhear some of the things delivered to you.”—Lecture v. s. 12, p. 58.

No. 5.

IN the extract from the ordination service, to which this number of the Appendix refers, we are reminded that it is the duty of the Presbyters of the Church of England "to seek for Christ's sheep that are dispersed abroad, and for his children who are in the midst of this naughty world," (i.e. a *world* that *lieth in wickedness*,) "that they may be saved through Christ for ever." When this passage is viewed in connexion with the principle of reserve in the communication of religious knowledge, which it is one great object of the Charge to combat, it is of supreme importance to ascertain with as much precision as possible, the legitimate acceptation of that complex term—the "*world*,"—as it is here introduced, and as it is generally applied in the New Testament.

There is no part of the internal evidence of the truth of Christianity which more decisively indicates it's Divine origin than it's adaptation to all the spiritual wants of man at all times, and the corresponding adaptation of it's phraseology to every varying condition and circumstance of the whole human race. If our blessed Lord said to the Jews—*Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven*: we must address the same language to Christians who are not fulfilling the obligations of their baptismal covenant. If St. Paul testified *both to the Jews, and also to the Greeks, repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ*: we must testify the same to Christians. If our Saviour forewarned his disciples that their faithful adherence to him, and their detachment from the world would expose them to the world's hatred, saying to them,—*If ye were of the world, the world would love his own; but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you*: when we, in imitation of our Divine Master, *testify of it, that the works thereof are evil*, and endeavour to live above it,

we likewise must be prepared to incur its displeasure. If St. Paul thus addresses his converts at Rome,—*Be ye not conformed to this world; but be ye transformed by the renewing of your minds*: we likewise should exhort “all them that are admitted into the fellowship of Christ’s religion,” by a noble and courageous singularity “to eschew those things that are contrary to their profession,” however popular or fashionable they may be; and to “follow all such things as are agreeable to the same,” however they may be decried and ridiculed by the irreligious men of the world.

But then, the question here meets us—who are included in this comprehensive term—“the world?” It is obvious that in the texts cited above, our blessed Lord employs the term in primary reference to the unbelieving Jews, and that St. Paul employs it in primary reference to the unconverted Gentiles. But when Christianity was nationally embraced, and the members of the Christian Church were admitted into covenant with God in their infancy by the ordinance of baptism, as the Israelites had before been by the rite of circumcision, the term assumed a different application, founded upon the exact analogy between the two cases. As it might have been truly said at every period of the Jewish history,—*they are not all Israel, which are of Israel: neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children*: so likewise under the gospel dispensation, the mystical Church, consisting of Christians who are such, not in profession only, but in reality, is not co-extensive with the visible Church.

The analogy to which I have alluded is clearly indicated in Rom. ii. 28, 29, as understood both by Bishop Beveridge and Bishop Bradford. The former observes, in a sermon on 2 Cor. v. 17, that “the truth is, (and it is a sad truth) men usually embrace and profess the Christian religion no otherwise than Turks do the Mohammedan, or other infidels the religions of their respective countries, only because it is the religion of their country. It was transmitted to them from their ancestors, it is now settled among

them, and professed by them they daily converse with ; and that is the only reason why they also profess it ; and then it is no wonder that they are but like other men, when they take up their religion merely by chance, without looking any further into it, or considering the mighty advantages it affords them, whereby to become the best and happiest of all creatures. But we must observe withal, that as the Apostle saith, *They are not all Israel, that are of Israel.* (Rom. ix. 6.) *For he is not a Jew which is one outwardly, neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh, but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly, and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter, whose praise is not of men, but of God.* (Rom. ii. 28-29.) So it is here ; all are not in Christ, that are of him, or his religion. Neither is he truly a Christian that is so outwardly, by the mere profession of the Christian faith : but he is truly a Christian, which is so inwardly, in his heart, whereby he really believes in Christ, and so partakes of that Holy Spirit that is in him for his sanctification, as well as of his merit for his justification before God ; being taken out as it were, from the first Adam, and joined by faith unto the second.”—Bishop Beveridge’s Sermons, vol. i. p. 166. Fol.

In a tract published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, entitled “ A Discourse concerning Baptismal and Spiritual Regeneration,” by Bishop Bradford, there is the following passage,—“ It is the way of the Scriptures to speak to and of the visible members of the Church of Christ, under such appellations and expressions as may seem at first hearing to imply, that they are all of them truly righteous and holy persons. Thus the Apostles style those to whom they write in general *Saints* : speak of them as *sanctified in CHRIST JESUS, chosen of GOD, buried with Christ in Baptism, risen again with him from the dead, sitting with him in heavenly places* ; and particularly St. Paul in my text says, *they were saved by the washing of Regeneration, &c.*

The reason of which is, that they were visibly by obligation and by profession all this: which was thus represented to them, the more effectually to stir them up and engage them to live according to their profession and obligation. But yet it is too evident, from divers passages in their writings, and experience has confirmed to us the same thing, that both in their times and ever since, there have been many who have enjoyed *the washing of Regeneration*, whose tempers and manners have demonstrated that they were not also *renewed by the Holy Ghost*. *Simon Magus* was a notorious instance to this purpose, who though the text tells that *he believed and was baptized*; yet was soon after told by St. Peter that *he had neither part nor lot in that matter*, (namely, the gift of the Holy Ghost) forasmuch as *his heart was not right in the sight of God*; and that he perceived that *he was in the gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity*. (Acts viii. 18, 21, 23.) I take it for granted that I need not insist upon any proof of this matter: but only farther observe that *Baptismal Regeneration*, when separated from the renewing of the Holy Ghost, must necessarily be ineffectual to the salvation of men's souls. St. Paul in my text joins them together, as concurring in the work of our salvation; and our Saviour, in the place before cited, makes the being *born of the spirit*, as well as of *water*, necessary to *the entering into the kingdom of GOD*. St. Peter in like manner, where he mentions *Baptism* as *saving us*, adds, to prevent all mistake, (*not the putting away the filth of the flesh*) (not that merely) *but the answer of a good conscience towards God*, 1 Peter iii. 21. that also is necessary to salvation; namely, when the baptized person's heart, and, consequently his life, agree with his profession, and obligation. What St. Paul says of the Jews, may be repeated with respect to Christians also, with a little variation of the words; *He is not a Christian, which is one outwardly; neither is that Regeneration*, (namely, such as will be effectual to salvation) *which is outward in the flesh: but he is a Christian which is one inwardly*;

and Regeneration is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter ; whose praise is not of men but of GOD. (Rom. ii. 28, 29.) Many of those who were not only baptized in the name of CHRIST, but also received excellent gifts from him and by virtue thereof *prophesied and had done many wonderful works in his name*, yet as himself declares will be rejected by him at the last day, for having been *workers of iniquity.*" (Matt. vii. 22, 23.)

Upon any question of doctrine the "Remains" of the late Mr. Froude is about the last theological work, written by a Clergyman of the Church of England, to which I should be disposed to attach the slightest weight. But as I see no reason to call his veracity in question, I will here cite his testimony as to matters of fact which are immediately connected with the subject under discussion. This testimony is the more deserving of attention, because it is not easy to reconcile the facts with some of his tenets.

In a sermon on 2 Pet. iii. 4. Mr. Froude says—"We are warranted then, by holy scripture, in forming very great anticipations of the results of Christ's coming. Let us consider what there is in the present aspect of human affairs to meet such anticipations. Is the state of society in which we live conformable with what we should have expected, if we only knew the glorious promises of his coming, and did *not* ourselves live in the days of their accomplishment? I think we must answer that it is not; and that to a superficial observer, the world, as we experience it, must seem a sufficient refutation of those oracles, which seem to promise something so very different. It is too true in one sense, *that all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation.* On all sides of us we see the same degree of hatred, covetousness, impurity, which have disgraced the earliest histories. The multitude of men are scarcely in any material respects different from what they would have been had they known nothing of Jesus Christ and the Gospel. There is little even in their external conduct and intercourse with each other that might

not as well be discharged by a deist, Jew, or a heathen. Mere natural religion might teach them a far higher standard of honesty, sobriety, chastity, and benevolence, than almost any man acts up to in his daily conduct." Again, in the same sermon, he observes—"Every one who does not shut his eyes to what is going on around him, must be aware that a large portion of those who profess to believe and receive the gospel, act deliberately and systematically in opposition to its commands?"—Remains of the late Rev. R. H. Froude, M.A. vol. ii. p. 202, 206. First Part.

From these admitted facts I should be led to deduce conclusions to which the admirers of the late Mr. Froude would not assent. I will mention two of them. In the first place, I should infer from them the total corruption and degeneracy of human nature. In the next place, I should discern in them the most conclusive evidence—not in apparent "refutation of those oracles which seem to promise something so very different,"—but in the fullest confirmation of them, and also assuring me that the glorious triumphs of the gospel are yet future, and that in despite of the present operation of antagonist principles, a time is hastening forward, when the Lord Jesus Christ *shall see more fully of the travail of his soul and shall be satisfied*,—when the Lord shall be King over all the earth: in that day shall there be one Lord, and his name one,—when men shall be all taught of God,—when they shall all know the Lord, from the least to the greatest,—and when the great purpose for which the Son of God was manifested, shall be fulfilled by his completely *destroying the works of the devil*.

But to return from this digression. "The world," then, as described by Mr. Froude, must be considered as including all those, who, whatever may be their external privileges, are living in contrariety, more or less flagrant, to the principles and precepts of the gospel of Christ. It includes all those of whom our Lord speaks, when he says:—*Wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in*

thereat. It includes all those who while they name *the name of Christ*, are not careful to *depart from iniquity*. In a word, it includes all who have been admitted into the Church of Christ by baptism, but do not conscientiously fulfil the stipulations of their baptismal covenant.

But in 1 John ii. 15, 16, 17, the term is used in a more enlarged and comprehensive sense, and includes all those objects in this sublunary state, which by captivating and ensnaring the senses, passions, and imagination, tend to alienate the affections from God, and to disqualify men for communion with him. The 16th. verse is thus paraphrased by Bishop Hall, "For all those things, wherewith the hearts of worldly men are taken up, which are reduced to these three heads, carnal lusts and concupiscences, covetous desires, proud and ambitious thoughts and affections, and such as are utterly abhorring from God, and are the mere baits of the world." Archbishop Usher, in his "Body of Divinity," page 335, speaking, in reference to the 15th. verse, defines the term "world," by describing it as "The corrupt state and condition of men and of the rest of the creatures, which Satan abuseth as his storehouse, or armory of temptations." This brief definition, therefore, may be considered as denoting the moral or theological acceptation of the term, as contradistinguished from its physical meaning.

This, I apprehend, is the sense in which the word is to be understood in the Church Catechism, in the "commendatory prayer for a sick person at the point of departure," and in the Ordination Service.

A child is taught in his Catechism to renounce "the pomps and vanity of this wicked world," which are styled by St. John, in the passage referred to above, *the lust of the eyes and the pride of life*. By "pomps," we are to understand, as it appears to me, worldly ambition and distinction, and the ostentatious display of riches and greatness: by "vanity," the superfluous decoration of the person, empty pleasures and amusements, and

frivolous occupations. These are objects of temptation, which are presented by an ensnaring world ; and they are objects of pursuit, which are followed by the irreligious men of the world.

The solemn and impressive passage of the "commendatory prayer" to which I have referred, I will give with the pious and learned Comber's paraphrase upon it. "Lest any stains of sin should make it (viz., the soul of the dying person) less lovely, *wash it we pray thee*, and cleanse it thoroughly, ere it go hence, *in the blood of Jesus Christ thy Son, that Immaculate Lamb, that* having no blemish in him, nor sin of his own upon him, *was slain* as an expiatory sacrifice *to take away* our sins, and *the sins of the whole world* ; O Lord, do thou so free it hereby, from the guilt, the punishment, and the power of iniquity, *that whatsoever defilements it may have contracted* by living and conversing among so many temptations *in the midst of this miserable and naughty world*, the very scene of sin and sorrow, where it is impossible to avoid all spots and stains, but either *through the lusts of the flesh* from within, or the wiles of Satan from without, we shall be more or less defiled, as we may justly fear this soul also is in some degree, but do thou have mercy on it, that all these *being purged and done away*, by the merits of Jesus Christ, *it may be presented pure* from sin, and without spot of iniquity, to stand with exceeding great joy *before thee* at thy tribunal, where it is shortly to appear."—Comber's Companion to the Temple. Part iv. p. 146.

It is, therefore, out of a world which is thus characterized both in the word of God, and in the Liturgy of our Church, which is in strict harmony and agreement with that word, that the Presbyters of the Church of England are to rescue the sheep and children of Christ, "that they may be saved through him for ever."

This article cannot be concluded more profitably than by an extract from Bishop Wilson's "Maxims of Piety," which not only confirms the foregoing observations, but also conveys the most important practical instruction.

“Love not the world,” is a precept on which depends our eternal weal or woe.

“World and religion.” The love of the world and religion are incompatible, and destroy one another.

“He that has set his heart upon the world, is not in a capacity of understanding the gospel.

“He who sees nothing in the world which he hopes for or desires, fears not its threats; is not tempted by its promises and baits of profits, honours, or any of its idols; is not driven to shifts; seeks no friendship, no composition with it; is free from avarice, envy, hatred, strife, &c. This is that noble freedom which the Son gives his servants.

“A Christian considers the world as a place of banishment, where he is like to meet with difficulties and dangers—enough to make him despair, were he not secure of an Almighty protection, and a prospect of an inestimable reward, if he continue firm to his God. He therefore will be very careful not to contract a fondness for a place where he is not like to continue long, and where he is sure to meet with no true satisfaction. He sees his own danger from what he observes in others, who are every day led by ill examples, corrupt customs, wicked principles, &c., as also by the pleasures, honours, and profits of the world. He sees dangers in every state of life, in poverty, in riches, &c., he therefore acts and lives as one who sees his danger, and the advantage of guarding against it.

“In the first place he considers, that his labour, whether it be to *know* or to *do* his duty, will not be in vain:—Happiness, and the way to it, are within his power;—nothing else is: All else is vanity. There is one only thing that, when we come to die, we shall repent of; namely, that we have not thought of our latter end betimes. We shall not be sorry that we have not had riches, learning, honours, &c., but that we have not made the care of our souls the great concern of our lives. It is too often that men think not of this till very late; and then begin to study how to live, when they are going to die.

"A Christian, that is wise for himself, will consider what the Spirit of God saith, *They that seek me early, shall find me*; (Prov. viii. 17.) that is, they shall find that wisdom and grace, which is necessary to secure them from the dangers they are liable to through the whole course of their lives : from themselves, from the world, or the devil, who suits his temptations to all states and conditions of life. A Christian therefore will walk circumspectly, as one who knows what he is to lose if he does not ;—he will walk by faith, not by sight ; that is, he will not be governed by his senses, but by his reason and by his faith, making this the measure of truth, namely, what God has made known to us, concerning another life ; which a wise Christian will always have his eye upon, that he may attain eternal life, and that he may escape eternal death ; which, if considered and believed, will quench all the fiery darts of the wicked one. To be for ever miserable,—to be for ever happy :—Let us dwell upon these ; let us consider what sort of life we lead,—where it will end ! It is for want of this that Christians miscarry.

"We never know how much we love the world, till we find pain and difficulty in parting with its good things.

"Have no more commerce with the world than is absolutely necessary ; and if you would have it to reverence you, treat it always with an holy severity.

"There is no condition of life (poverty, riches, &c.) in which a Christian is not obliged to renounce the world, as he hopes for heaven ; no man can love God with all his soul, who has not renounced the love of the world.

"The world condemns without mercy all those, who either condemn, or will not follow its maxims.

"Whoever loves the world will never retain the word of God in his heart.

"When a man thoroughly knows this world, what its spirit is, and what its end must be, he is prepared for all events, and is troubled at nothing ; looking upon himself as a citizen of another world.

“Love of the world. We are equally obliged to renounce the world, the *flesh*, and the *devil*. We see plainly the sin of following the two last. We overlook this great truth, that it is the love of the world which gives the other all their power over us, and ministers occasions of such sins as we abhor the thoughts of, till we are ruined by them.

“The spirit of the world is the love of sensual pleasures, which fixes the heart to this world, so that it cannot raise itself to God. God will have the heart entire; when it is filled with the world, there is no place for him.

“Religion accounts most of those pleasures criminal, and as leading to the greatest sins, which the world calls innocent: if we are to be governed by voices, religion will lose the cause.

“Worldly happiness. See what it does upon those that have their heart’s desires. Their faith is weak; they are less concerned for the happiness of another life; they desire to set up their rest here.

“Worldly advantages. God could very easily give worldly affluence; but he kindly denies, restrains, or deprives us of them, lest we should set our hearts upon them; and that we might *love him* above all things.

“Worldly motives. When a man resists, on human motives only, he will not hold out long.

“Worldly pleasures. They who give themselves up to pleasures, are making themselves chains not easy to be broken.

“Marks of a worldly spirit. A concern for pomp and shew of life; great exactness in the modes and customs; a quick sense of honour, and reputation, and praise; study of ease and pleasure; a desire to grow rich, &c.”—Bishop Wilson’s Works. Vol. i. p. 376.

No. 6.

HOWEVER the Author of the Tract on "Reserve" may differ from Dr. Chalmers and from the Moravians, upon questions of Church government, it is to be presumed that he is not disposed to impugn the veracity of either. Taking it for granted, therefore, that their testimony will not be disputed, I will here insert the account given by Dr. Chalmers, and, through his works, by a Moravian writer of the success consequent upon preaching fully and unreservedly the great doctrine of the atonement. Dr. Chalmers in an address to his former flock, the inhabitants of the parish of Kilmany, speaks thus of the course of religious instruction which he had pursued amongst them :—"And here I cannot but record the effect of an actual though undesigned experiment, which I prosecuted for upwards of twelve years among you. For the greater part of that time, I could expatiate on the meanness of dishonesty, on the villainy of falsehood, on the despicable arts of calumny,—in a word, upon all those deformities of character, which awaken the natural indignation of the human heart against the pests and the disturbers of human society. Now could I, upon the strength of these warm expostulations, have got the thief to give up his stealing, and the evil speaker his censoriousness, and the liar his deviations from truth, I should have felt all the repose of one who had gotten his ultimate object. It never occurred to me that all this might have been done, and yet every soul of every hearer have remained in full alienation from God ; and that even could I have established in the bosom of one who stole, such a principle of abhorrence at the meanness of dishonesty, that he was prevailed upon to steal no more, he might still have retained a heart as completely unturned to God, and as totally unpossessed by a principle of love to Him, as before. In a word, though I might have made him a more upright and honourable man, I might have left him as destitute of the essence of

religious principle as ever. But the interesting fact is, that during the whole of that period in which I made no attempt against the natural enmity of the mind to God, while I was inattentive to the way in which this enmity is dissolved, even by the free offer on the one hand, and the believing acceptance on the other, of the gospel salvation ; while Christ, through whose blood the sinner, who by nature stands afar off, is brought near to the heavenly Lawgiver whom he has offended, was scarcely ever spoken of, or spoken of in such a way, as stripped Him of all the importance of His character and His offices, even at this time I certainly did press the reformations of honour, and truth, and integrity among my people ; but I never once heard of any such reformations having been effected amongst them. If there was any thing at all brought about in this way, it was more than ever I got any account of. I am not sensible, that all the vehemence with which I urged the virtues and the proprieties of social life had the weight of a feather on the moral habits of my parishioners. And it was not till I got impressed by the utter alienation of the heart in all its desires and affections from God ; it was not till reconciliation to Him became the distinct and the prominent object of my ministerial exertions ; it was not till I took the scriptural way of laying the method of reconciliation before them ; it was not till the free offer of forgiveness through the blood of Christ was urged upon their acceptance, and the Holy Spirit given through the channel of Christ's mediatorship to all who ask Him, was set before them as the unceasing object of their dependence and their prayers ; it was not, in one word, till the contemplations of my people were turned to these great and essential elements in the business of a soul providing for its interest with God, and the concerns of its eternity, that I ever heard of any of those subordinate reformations which I aforetime made the earnest and the zealous, but I am afraid at the same time, the ultimate object of my earlier ministrations."—Chalmers' Works. Vol. xii. p. 108—110.

In the same volume Dr. Chalmers thus introduces an extract from "Spangenberg's account of the manner in which the United Brethren carry on their Missions among the Heathens."—"These observations may serve to account for the mistaken principle upon which many admirers of the United Brethren give them the preference over all other missionaries. We are ready to concur in the preference, but not in the principle upon which they found it. They conceive that the Moravians make no attempt towards christianizing the heathen, till they have gone through the long preparatory work of training them up in the arts of life, and in the various moralities and decencies of social intercourse. This is a very natural supposition; but nothing can be more untrue. It is doing just what every superficial man is apt to do in other departments of observation—mistaking the effect for the cause. They go to a missionary establishment of United Brethren among the heathen. They pay a visit to one of their villages, whether in Greenland, in S. Africa, or on the coast of Labrador. It is evident that the cleanly houses, cultivated gardens, and neat specimens of manufacture, will strike the eye much sooner—than the unseen principle of this wonderful revolution in the habits of savages will unfold itself to the discernment of the mind. And thus it is, that in their description of all this, they reverse the actual process. They tell us that these most rational of all missionaries, begin their attempts on the heathen by the work of civilizing them; that they teach them to weave, to till, and to store up winter provisions, and to observe justice in their dealings with one another; and then, and not till then, do they, somehow or other, implant upon this preliminary dressing, the mysteries and peculiarities of the Christian Faith. Thus it is that these men of mere spectacle begin to philosophize on the subject, and set up the case of the Moravians as a reproach and an example to all other missionaries.

"Now we venture to say that the Moravians at the *outset* of their conference with savages, keep at as great a distance from

any instruction about the arts of weaving, and sewing, and tilling land, as the Apostle Paul did, when he went about among Greeks and barbarians, charged with the message of salvation to all who would listen and believe. He preached nothing but *Jesus Christ and him crucified*, and neither do they; and the faith which attends the word of their testimony, how foolish and fanatical soever it may appear in the eyes of worldly men, proves it to be the power of God and the wisdom of God unto salvation. It is another evidence of the foolishness of God being wiser than men, and the weakness of God being stronger than men. However wonderful it may be, yet such is the fact, that a savage, when spoken to on the subject of his soul, of sin, and of the Saviour, has his attention more easily compelled, and his resistance more effectually subdued, than when he is addressed upon any other subject whether of moral or economical instruction. And this is precisely the way in which Moravians have gone to work. They preached the peculiar tenets of the New Testament at the very outset. They gained converts through that Faith which cometh by hearing. These converts multiplied, and, in many instances, they have settled around them. It is true that they have had unexampled success in the business of civilizing their disciples; but it has arisen from their having stood longer on the vantage ground of the previous knowledge of Christianity with which they had furnished them, than any other missionaries; and the peace, and order, and industry, which are represented by rash and superficial observers, as the antecedents of the business, are, in fact, so many consequents flowing out of the mighty influence which attends the word of their testimony.

“It is well that the Moravians have risen into popular admiration. This will surely give weight to their testimony about their own matters. And when one of their members publishes an account of the manner in which the United Brethren preach the Gospel, and carry on their missions among the heathen, information from such a quarter will surely be looked upon as of higher

authority than the rapid description of a traveller. Now such a treatise has been published by Spangenberg ; and it does not appear that any preparatory civilisation is now attempted by their missionaries, who have been engaged in the business for many years, and have been eminent above all others, both for their experience and their success. We shall subjoin a few extracts as being completely decisive upon this point.—

“ ‘The method of the brethren to bring the heathen to Christ was, in the beginning of their attempts, particularly in Greenland, nearly as follows :—

“ ‘They proved to the heathen that there is a God, and spoke to them of His attributes and perfections. In the next place, they spoke upon the creation ;—how God had made man after His own image, which, however, was soon lost by the fall. They then made the heathen acquainted with the laws which God gave by His servant Moses. Hence they proved to them that they were sinners, and had deserved temporal and eternal punishment. And from this they drew the consequence, that there must be one who reconciled them to God, &c.

“ ‘This method of teaching they continued for a long time, but without any success, for the heathen became tired of such discourses. If it be asked, how happened it that the brethren fell upon the said method, I must confess that I am apprehensive I was myself the cause of it. The first brethren who were destined for Greenland, went to Copenhagen by way of Halle, where I at that time lived. They tarried a few days with me, and conversed with me relative to their intentions. Upon this, I gave them a book to read, (for I knew no better at that time) in which a certain divine treated, among the rest, of the method to convince and to bring the heathen to Christ. The good man had probably never seen an heathen in all his life, much less converted any ; but yet he imagined he could give directions how to set about it. The brethren followed them, but without success.

“ ‘Meanwhile, it pleased the Lord our Saviour to give the con-

gregation at Herrnhut more insight into the word of atonement through the offering of Jesus. Nor were the brethren wanting in declaring to those in Greenland, that they must preach Jesus Christ, if they meant to produce any blessing among the heathen. Upon this, the brethren began to translate some parts of the gospel, especially what relates to the sufferings and death of Jesus, and read that to the brethren. This gave an opportunity to speak with them farther on that head. Then God opened their hearts that they attended to the word, and it proved to them also the power of God. They became desirous of hearing more about it, and the fire which had been kindled in them by the Holy Ghost, spread farther and farther. And thus many were converted to God : since which time the brethren were frequently asked by the heathen, why they did not preach sooner to them of Jesus ; that they had been quite tired of hearing the discourses about God, and the two first parents, &c.

“ ‘ Above thirty years ago, when I lived in North America, I sometimes got the brethren that were used occasionally in the service of our Lord to come together, in order that I might converse with them about their labours. Johannes, an Indian of the Mahikander nation, who had formerly been a very wicked man, but was now thoroughly converted, and was our fellow-labourer in the congregation gathered from among the heathens at that time dwelling in Chekomekah, happened to be just then on a visit with us, and also came to our little meeting. He was a man that had excellent gifts, was a bold confessor of what he knew to be true, and understood the German language so as to express himself with sufficient clearness. As we were speaking with one another about the heathen, he said, among other things,—‘ Brethren, I have been an heathen, and am grown old among them ; I know, therefore, very well how it is with the heathen. A preacher came once to us, desiring to instruct us, and began by proving to us that there was a God. On which we said to him, Well, and dost thou think we are ignorant of that ? now go again

whence thou camest. Another preacher came another time, and would instruct us, saying, Ye must not steal, not drink too much, not lie, &c. We answered him, Fool, that thou art! dost thou think that we do not know that? go and learn it first thyself, and teach the people thou belongest to not to do these things. For who are greater drunkards, or thieves, or liars, than thine own people? Thus we sent him away also. Some time after this Christian Henry, one of the brethren, came to me into my hut, and sat down by me. The contents of his discourse to me were nearly these:—I come to thee in the name of the Lord of heaven and earth. He acquaints thee that he would gladly save thee, and rescue thee from the miserable state in which thou liest. To this end he became a man, hath given his life for mankind, and shed his blood for them, &c. Upon this he lay down upon a board in my hut and fell a-sleep, being fatigued with his journey. I thought within myself,—what manner of man is this? there he lies and sleeps so sweetly; I might kill him immediately, and throw him out into the forest, who would care for it? but he is unconcerned. However, I could not get rid of his words: they continually recurred to me; and though I went to sleep, yet I dreamed of the blood which Christ had shed for us. I thought—this is very strange, and went to interpret to the other Indians the words which Christian Henry spake farther to us. Thus, through the grace of God, the awakening among us took place. I tell you, therefore, brethren, preach to the heathen Christ and his blood, and his death, if ye would wish to produce a blessing among them.’ Such was the exhortation of Johannes, the Mahikander, to us.

“‘But the brethren were already, before that time, convinced that Jesus Christ must be the marrow and substance of the preaching of the Gospel among the heathen, even as He is in general called, with justice, the marrow and substance of the whole Bible. The ground of this position is contained in Sect. 9, and following, where we treated of the Apostles’ labours among

the Gentiles. Nor shall we do amiss if we follow the method of the Apostles, who, in their office, were under the peculiar leadings of the Holy Spirit, as far as it is applicable to us. Hence what Paul writes to the Corinthians, *I determined not to know any thing among you save Jesus Christ, and him crucified*,—is a firmly established rule for us in preaching to the heathen.’”—Chalmers’ Works. Vol. xii. p. 256—262.

No. 7.

IN this number I shall submit to the reader’s attention some more quotations from the Tract on “Reserve in communicating Religious Knowledge”—a Tract which has already called forth severe and merited animadversions from different quarters.

The following extract from the works of Origen appears to me to reflect as little credit upon the judgment of that ancient Father, as it does upon that of the writer who has espoused his sentiments. “It must be observed, as a general truth, that where it is the purpose to throw a veil over, and not openly to set forth the sentiments of truth, whether it be by the spirit of Christ speaking in the Prophets, or by his word in the Apostles, there is often a confusion, or obscurity, in the diction, and the order of the sentiments is not clear and unbroken, to prevent those who are unworthy from discovering, to the condemnation of their souls, things which it is for their good should be concealed from them. And hence it is oftentimes the case that there appears a want of order and connexion in different parts of scripture, especially, as we said before, in the prophetical and apostolical parts. And in the latter, especially in the Epistle to the Romans, in which things concerning the law are spoken of, and in such different ways, and under such different circumstances, that it might have appeared as if St. Paul had not the object of that epistle distinctly before his mind in writing it.”—P. 27.

From the following passage at p. 41, it appears that the Writer

has profited by the teaching of the Fathers on the subject of Celibacy as well as of "Reserve." "Moreover, it is to such as Daniel, 'the man of loves,' which are divine and not earthly, that revelations are made: and it is worthy of consideration, that those who speak of the intimate union of Christ with his Church, under the type of marriage, are the Baptist, St. Paul, and St. John. As if it were to the higher, or virgin, state of life that the mysteries signified by this figure were confided."

The Writer of this Tract is certainly an ingenious, though I must take leave to consider him as a pre-eminently mistaken, man. But by what stretch of ingenuity he can reconcile the following statement with the eleventh and twelfth articles, I can by no means comprehend. "The great doctrines which of late years have divided Christians, are again of this kind very peculiarly, such as the subjects of faith and works, of the free grace of God, and obedience on the part of man. They seem to be left in scripture in a way to give rise to all these disputations among (if I may so speak) the multitude who are without: I mean to say, among those who do not labour to obtain the knowledge of them by obedience, and in practical seriousness of mind, (i.e. the disciples, of whom it is written, he said, *Follow me*, and *they followed him*.) For they appear to be great secrets, notwithstanding whatever may be said of them, only revealed to the faithful. What I would say is, that fully to know that we are saved by faith in Christ only, and not by any works of our own, and that we can do nothing, excepting by the grace of God, is a great secret,—the knowledge of which can only be obtained by obedience,—as the crown and end of great holiness of life."—P. 48.

The practical principle which it appears to be the great object of the Writer of this Tract to enforce, is, that the fundamental doctrines of Christianity should be withheld from men till they have rendered themselves worthy of their reception. Indeed, it is doubtful whether, according to the judgment of the Writer, religious instruction should be imparted at all to those who are living

in a sinful state. He observes, in reference to the errors of the times, that "there seems also an impatience at any book being held back from any person, as too high and sacred for them; it is a thing not understood. And so far from it being considered necessary to keep persons from Church on account of irreligious lives, it is usually thought that every thing is done, if they can be brought to it."—P. 63.

In the same spirit the Author remarks, at p. 68, "With regard to the building of Churches, our Lord's testimony to the widow's mite and the costly ointment, and to the intention of the man after his own heart, prove such works to be in the highest degree acceptable to him, and therefore necessarily productive of good. And the sacrifices they require are greatly beneficial to the individual, merely as religious sacrifices. * * * * *

But when the utilitarian view of the subject is taken, are we not thinking that we may do by human means, and such as partake of this world, that which is the work of God alone, as if the mammon of this world could promote the cause of God? For if the erection of Churches, which from commodiousness and easiness of access are to invite, and from their little cost partake more of a low contriving expediency than of a generous love of God, is to do the work of religion, then is it more easy to win souls than scripture will warrant us in supposing. On the contrary, if the maxim be true, that 'men venerate that which resisteth them, and that which courteth their favour they despise,' then have we to fear lest, rather than doing good, we be breaking that holy law, which hath commanded, that we give not that which is holy to the dogs; the Church's best gifts be trod under foot, and her enemies turn again and rend her. For if Churches are to be brought home to all, then are all persons to be brought into Churches, and this by human means. Thus immediately connected with that view alluded to is that of eloquence and pleasing delivery, a powerful worldly engine, unlike that weak instrument which St. Paul calls *the foolishness of preaching*." To these

words is appended the following note,—“It is worthy of notice, that the Parisian Breviary, in its long services for the Feast of Dedication, composed of passages from scripture, hymns, and homilies, there appears no allusion to this end as the object of building Churches, viz., the converting of persons by preaching. It abounds with allusions to the spiritual temple, and to the awful presence of God in his sacraments. Whatever objections may be made to this testimony, it serves at all events to prove what the religion of a former age was.”

Again, at p. 70, the Writer speaking of the “indiscriminate distribution of bibles and religious publications,” thus remarks upon it:—“We must not expect that the work, which occasioned our Saviour and his disciples so much pains, can be done by such means. We have rather to look with awe on these new dealings of Providence with mankind. It might perhaps be thought that, if it is a state of the heart alone which can receive the truth, to bring it forward before persons unprepared to acknowledge it, does not signify. Such persons cannot receive it, and therefore the effect is merely nugatory and unavailing. But this does not follow: that they cannot receive it is the appointment of God; but our attempting to act contrary to his mode of acting may be productive of evil.”

Such sentiments as these appear to me to require no comment. The bare recital of them must be sufficient to ensure their instantaneous rejection by every one whose judgment has not been warped, or understanding beclouded by the pernicious influence of the Oxford Tract system.

Having, in the Charge, discussed the Writer's application of his principle of “Reserve” to the doctrine of the atonement, I will add no further remarks of my own. But I will do that which will be much more useful and interesting to the reader: I will present him with the opinion of Bishop Beveridge upon the subject of the knowledge of *Jesus Christ and him crucified*, which exhibits a perfect contrast to that of the Author of this Tract, and

completely harmonizes with the facts mentioned in the preceding article of this Appendix.

“In order to our being saved, there are two things required, repentance and faith. As for the first, although many excellent arguments may be drawn from the majesty of God’s person, from the severity of his justice, from the glory of his goodness, from the righteousness of his law, from the beauty of holiness, from the odiousness of sin, from the dreadful consequences of it, and from many other topics, which one would think sufficient to persuade any man to repent and turn to God, yet nothing can do it effectually without the *knowledge of Jesus Christ*. For after all, it is he that gives repentance, and he never gives it to any but to those who know him ; none else being capable of receiving it from him, but they who know him are in the ready way to have it.

“For to know *Jesus Christ and him crucified*, is in itself the most powerful argument to work in us true repentance. To know Jesus, the eternal Son of God, of the same substance with the Father : to know Jesus, both God and man in one person : to know Jesus Christ, the truest Prophet, the greatest King, the highest Priest in the world : to know *Jesus Christ and him crucified* : to know how this glorious, this Almighty, this divine person was abused by his own creatures : how he was apprehended, arraigned, accused, and condemned as a criminal ; how he was derided, scourged, spit upon, crowned with thorns, and led among the vilest of malefactors to the place of execution : how he was there fastened to a piece of wood, with nails drove through his blessed hands and feet, the most nervous and sensible parts of the whole body : how he hung in this sad ignominious posture for three long hours together, and all that while endured not only the most exquisite pains that could be imagined, in his body ; but such a sense of his Father’s displeasure, in his soul, as made him cry out, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me ?* and how, after all this, the pains of death coming upon him, the Lord of life himself gave up the ghost and died ; and died upon the

cross, the only cursed death that any man could die: to know that Jesus Christ was thus crucified, and that he was crucified thus for the sins of men, and for our sins among the rest:—what can, if this doth not, dissolve us all into tears, into tears of true repentance for those sins which were the occasion of it? How can we know that Jesus Christ was crucified for sin, and not dread the thoughts of God's displeasure against it? How can we know that he was crucified for our sins, and not abhor and leave them? Surely it is impossible! it is impossible that our minds should be filled with such a knowledge of Christ as this, and yet retain any love for sin, for any sin whatsoever. And therefore the Apostle saith, *That men escape the pollutions of the world, and so the dominion of all manner of vice, through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*, 2 Pet. ii. 20. This being the most effectual means to do it, and that which never fails: insomuch, that whosoever lives in any known sin, may be confident that he doth not know Christ as he ought.

“And the great reason is, because he who thus knows Christ, what he hath done and suffered for mankind, cannot but believe and trust in him, as his only and all-sufficient Saviour. And he who doth that, is thereby entitled to all the promises of the gospel, for every thing necessary to his being saved, they being all made to those, and to those only who believe in Christ. Hence it is that we are so often said to be justified by faith, to be saved by faith, to be sanctified by faith, to be purified by faith, to resist the devil by faith, and to overcome the world by faith. Neither is there any other way whereby it is possible for a man to do it. I speak it confidently, because I have God's own word for it, saying, *Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?* 1 John v. 5. If there were no other, as there are a great many, this one place of scripture is sufficient to demonstrate against all the Pelagians, Socinians, Arians, and Mahometans, in the world, that no man can ever truly overcome it, so as to be and do good in it, except he believe

in Christ. Whereas he who doth this, can *do all things through Christ which strengtheneth him*. But as no man can know Christ aright, but he must needs believe in him; so no man can believe aright in him unless he first know him. For *how can he believe in him of whom he hath not heard*, and so doth not know what to believe? Rom. x. 14. And therefore to know *Jesus Christ and him crucified*, is so useful, so necessary for all men, that no man can be either holy or happy without it.”—Bishop Beveridge’s Sermons. Vol. i. p. 159.

No. 8.

It would be a source of much satisfaction to me, if the quotations which I am about to make from an excellent treatise by the Rev. G. Pearson, late Christian Advocate in the University of Cambridge, might be instrumental in creating an additional demand for it. The work in question is entitled “The Testimony of our Lord’s discourses to the Divinity of his Person and Character.” The object, therefore, of the treatise, as stated by the Author in the first sentence of his introductory chapter, is “to consider the evidence in support of the Divinity of the Person and Character of our Saviour, which may be derived from a review of his different discourses and declarations.” The investigation is conducted, in my opinion, with much ability, with an accurate knowledge of scripture, and with sound theological views. It is obvious, however, that the main argument has no connexion with the subjects discussed either in the Charge, or in the Appendix. But in the prosecution of it, the Author is naturally led to notice the “reserve” which our blessed Lord adopted previously to his death and resurrection, and the partial and defective manner in which, before that time, his own disciples comprehended those great truths and fundamental doctrines, which, after the effusion of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost, they clearly understood, and fearlessly proclaimed without any suppression or “reserve.”

The remarks of this judicious and intelligent Writer upon the

subject of the "reserve" in question are the more deserving of attention, because they were made before the Oxford Tract, from which quotations are given in the preceding number, was published. They are, therefore, exempt from the slightest suspicion of any controversial bias. From the extracts which are subjoined, the reader will perceive that this "reserve" is accounted for in the most satisfactory manner, and that the preposterous idea of proposing it as an object of imitation, when no reason for its continuance, and every reason for its discontinuance, existed, never entered into the mind of the Author.

"It is evident that we cannot expect to find in the gospels a full revelation of all the mysteries of redemption, or a complete knowledge of its doctrines and its duties; because the great scheme of salvation was yet incomplete, till the Son of God had suffered on the cross and had ascended up to heaven to the right hand of God. Our Saviour himself told his disciples just before his death: *"I have many things to say unto you; but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth."* This was the case, when at the very commencement of his ministry he uttered that remarkable prediction of his death and resurrection: *Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up.* This speech was so little understood by the Jews, that they immediately observed: *Forty and six years was this temple in building, and wilt thou rear it up in three days;* and we know that they made this speech the foundation of an accusation against him at the last. But St. John tells us, that *he spake of the temple of his body. When therefore he was risen from the dead, his disciples remembered that he had spoken this unto them; and they believed the scripture and the word which Jesus had said.*" Now this passage affords at once an instance of the purposed obscurity in which our Saviour involved many of his most important revelations, and of the force with which this mode of revelation afterwards struck their minds, when the predictions were fulfilled, and

they were enlightened by the Holy Spirit from on high : and the same observation may be made with regard to other incidents in our Saviour's life. In the same manner also, he was sparing of his declarations of his own divine Person and character ; it was only on a few occasions that he spoke clearly on this subject, even to his chosen friends and disciples : and, even on some of these, when a consideration of his teaching and miracles had extracted from them a confession of his divine character, he enjoined silence upon them. Such was the case upon the occasion, when St. Peter, in the name of the Apostles, made the profession, that he was *the Christ the Son of the living God* ; and such also was the case after the Transfiguration, when "*he charged the disciples to tell the vision to no man, till he was risen from the dead.*" For although he continually spoke of God as his Father, it does not appear that his meaning was in general clearly understood either by his own disciples or by the Jews who heard him ; and on those occasions, when he spoke with more than his usual clearness, so that his words appeared to imply either a divine origin, or an equality with the Father, he immediately roused the anger of the Jews, as if he was guilty of blasphemy against God.

" ' In this method of revealing the gospel there was,' as has been remarked by a learned writer, ' both dignity and propriety. For the Son of God came from heaven not only to make a new revelation, but to be the subject of it, by doing and suffering all that was necessary to procure the salvation of mankind.' Indeed, it is evident from a review of our Lord's discourses, and from the conduct of his disciples on different occasions, when he spoke more plainly on the subject of his death and resurrection, that he went as far, in making these disclosures, as was consistent with prudence, and with the prejudices and mistakes of his followers with regard to his Person and character ; and that, in this state of their minds, any more open revelation would have been premature, either of doctrines, which depended upon events connected with himself, which they were so reluctant to believe, or of duties,

which derived their whole complexion and character from these doctrines; and which would receive their whole character and complexion, both in their motives and their object, from their connexion with the Redeemer, and with their faith in his incarnation, his death, his resurrection, and his ascension to heaven to the right-hand of God.

“The truth of these observations will appear more evident, the more attentively we review all the circumstances connected with our Saviour, and the introduction of his religion into the world. Our Saviour came to reveal a new religion; new, not only in its doctrines, but in the duties resulting from these doctrines. It was not till after his resurrection that our Lord himself attempted to unfold to his disciples the prophecies relating to it; nor till after his ascension into heaven, could either the doctrines or the duties connected with this great event be consistently either enforced or understood: and, in the same manner, with respect to his death, —though it is the corner stone of the Christian faith, the foundation on which the great doctrines of Christianity are built, the doctrine, which, of all others, influences the whole scheme of Christian faith and practice; it would have been impossible, as indeed it was proved by the example of the Apostles themselves, to make persons comprehend it during the period of our Saviour’s ministry upon earth. But when their minds had been enlightened by the Holy Spirit from on high, and they began to view it in connexion with the innocence of our Saviour’s life and the great objects to be attained by it; and when, moreover, they considered the long train of prophecy, by which it was foretold, the reasonableness of the doctrine at once broke in upon their minds, and the effects of this conviction were seen in their conduct afterwards, and in the influence which it produced on their lives.

“Although, therefore, we must not expect to find in the discourses of our Saviour a full exposition either of the doctrines or the duties of the gospel; which indeed are contained in the writings of the Apostles and Evangelists, and which they were

enabled to unfold in all their power after they were enlightened by the Holy Spirit ; yet we may expect to find a perfect agreement between the revelations which are contained in our Saviour's discourses and in the Apostolical writings,—the agreement which ought to subsist between the different parts of one harmonious whole. And such an agreement will afford a powerful argument in support of the divine character of our Redeemer. For it is manifestly impossible, that such intimations of the bearing of the whole scheme of Redemption, as are contained in our Saviour's discourses, could have proceeded from any one, who had not the whole plan laid open before him : and the consideration of the reasons, which prevented our divine Master from making at once a full revelation of the doctrines and duties of his religion, and of the divine skill with which he opened these important truths to their minds, as they were able to bear them, increases the interest with which we view the whole subject ; and affords additional evidence of the divine character of Him, who, as he contrived and executed this wonderful plan for the salvation of men, provided for its revelation in such a manner, as to give additional weight to the testimony, which the religion itself afforded, that it was from God.”—P. 2—7.

“ The death of our Saviour, for the salvation of mankind, and his resurrection and ascension into heaven, were the subjects of dark and distant revelation by those prophets, who *testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow* ; and they are made the constant topic of animated and delightful reflection by the Apostles and Evangelists of our Lord, who have spoken so fully with respect to the great scheme of our salvation, as it is connected with Him, *who died, yea rather that is risen again, who is ever at the right-hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us*. But we know, with what difficulty our Saviour was able to introduce the subject of his sufferings, even to his chosen disciples ; who might have been expected to entertain more correct views with regard to his real character.

This was seen on two remarkable occasions: the first, when Peter having in the name of the Apostles made that memorable confession to our Saviour, that he was *the Christ the Son of the living God*, our Lord *began to teach them, that the Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected by the elders, and of the chief priests, and scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again*. Upon this occasion, *Peter took him and began to rebuke him*. Another occasion was immediately after the Transfiguration; when, upon our Lord charging them that they should tell no man what things they had seen till the Son of Man were risen from the dead, St. Mark relates, that *they kept that saying with themselves, questioning one with another what the rising from the dead should mean*. If such then was the state of mind of the chosen disciples themselves, we cannot expect much clearer views amongst the Jewish people in general: and the absolute inability of the people, in their present state, to comprehend more clearly his real character, may be regarded as one reason why our Lord himself observed, and enjoined his disciples to observe, so much reserve with regard to some of his most important revelations.

It is evident, however, that our Lord sometimes vouchsafed to speak more openly on these subjects: and, even when he observed the greatest reserve, we may expect to find a perfect harmony, not only with his own more clear intimations, but also with those more full revelations, which were made by his Apostles after he had risen again from the dead. It is in the skill with which our Saviour introduced these subjects to his disciples and followers, so as not to offend their bigotry and prejudices; in the comprehensive character of these apparently obscure intimations; in the manner in which he adapted the degree of light, which he thought proper to throw upon them in his conversations with his disciples and the Jewish people, to the present state of their minds, and so that they might strike them more forcibly afterwards, when they were enlightened by the Holy Spirit from

on high,—that we perceive the divine wisdom of our heavenly teacher. Such wisdom could have proceeded from him alone, who *knew all things and knew what was in man*.

“The first intimation which our Saviour appears to have given of his death and sufferings, is contained in his discourse with Nicodemus : and the manner in which it is introduced is remarkable ; because it immediately follows a passage, in which our Lord asserted his divine origin, and foretold his ascension into heaven : *No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven : and as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life. For God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved.* Now the meaning of the expression, which is here used by our Saviour, of being lifted up, must have been obscure to those who heard it ; as is the case in two other passages in which it is found,—when he says, *when we shall have lifted up the Son of Man, then ye shall know that I am he ;* and again, *Now is the judgment of this world ; now shall the Prince of this world be cast out. And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me* And the same is the case with the word saved, as it is used in connection with the sending of the Son of Man ; which, though, in its full meaning, it comprehends everything which was to be done by our Saviour with reference to our salvation, could convey no definite idea to those persons to whom it was immediately addressed. But St. John himself has explained the meaning of our Saviour’s expression of being lifted up, when, with reference to the last passage in which it is found, he adds, *This he said, signifying what death he should die :* and a flood of light is thrown over these apparently obscure intimations of our Saviour, when

we compare them with the more clear revelations of his Apostles ; who teach us, that it was by his being lifted up upon the cross that our Redeemer accomplished our salvation and obtained pardon for a guilty world. It was impossible that our Saviour, in the present state of their minds, could fully explain to his hearers and followers the exact sense in which the Father might be said to give his Son for the salvation of the world, or the exact nature of that salvation which he was to accomplish for us. But we may observe, that this discourse of our Saviour, obscure as it must have been to those who immediately heard it,—at the same time that it contains a full revelation of every thing which our Saviour was to do and suffer for our redemption,—affords also a solution of a transaction in the Old Testament, which itself is obscure and attended with difficulty, till it is viewed in connexion with the peculiar character and circumstances of our Saviour's death.

“ Our Lord, in giving those directions to the Apostles after he had called them, in which he prepared them for trials and sufferings, makes use of the following expressions: *He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me : and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me. And he that taketh not his cross, and followeth after me, is not worthy of me :* and again, when,—upon our Lord telling his disciples, that *he must suffer many things of the chief priests, and elders, and scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day. Peter began to rebuke him, saying, Be it far from thee, Lord, this shall not be unto thee,*—he gave that severe reproof to Peter, *Get thee behind me, Satan, for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but the things that be of men ;* he added in conclusion that remarkable exhortation to his disciples, *If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me.* Now the purport of these words is very plain,—that whoever would be his followers must be prepared for persecutions and sufferings: but they were spoken by our Lord prospectively, with reference to his own death: and how affect-

ing is the illustration which we derive from the peculiar circumstances of his death, when we behold the Son of God bearing that cross, on which he was to be crucified ! And the full power of the allusion was felt by St. Paul, when he said, *God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world ; and again, I am resolved not to know any thing among you save Jesus Christ and him crucified ; and again, They that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts ; and, lastly, when he spoke of the faith of Christ crucified as the source of his spiritual life : I am crucified with Christ : nevertheless I live ; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me : and the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.*"—P. 37—42.

" Finally, in the declarations, which he made to his disciples, of his ascension up to heaven ; of his sending the Holy Spirit ; of his being their Advocate and Intercessor with his Father ; of prayer being made to the Father in his name ; he spoke as plainly as was consistent with the capacity of his disciples to receive these important truths. But it was sufficient to prepare them for that more full revelation, which was afterwards to be made by his Apostles ; who have taught us, that that same Redeemer, who died for us on the cross, is the great High Priest and Intercessor with the Father for the people whom he has redeemed with his blood ; in whose name we are enabled to approach the throne of grace, *giving thanks to God and the Father through Him ; even Jesus, who died, yea rather that is risen again, who is ever at the right-hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.*

" It is evident, therefore, that those persons take an erroneous view of the gospels, who endeavour, with respect to the great doctrines of our religion, to draw a line of distinction between them and the more complete revelations which are contained in the writings of the Apostles of the Lord : whereas the discourses

of our Lord contain the seeds of all those great doctrines, which are so fully illustrated and explained in subsequent revelations,—delivered with as much clearness as was suited to the capacities of his followers, and as was possible, while the great scheme of redemption was yet incomplete, and the Redeemer had not yet ascended up to heaven to the right-hand of God: and the more we consider the divine skill, with which our divine Master revealed these great truths, as his disciples were able to receive them, and in such a manner, that they might afterwards strike more forcibly upon their minds, when they were enlightened by the Holy Spirit from on high,—the more must we be convinced of the divine character of Him, who planned the great scheme of Redemption in the councils of eternity, and in the fulness of time took upon him our flesh that he might reveal it to mankind.”—P. 51—53.

No. 9.

IN the ninth Article it is stated that original sin “is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man that naturally is ingendered of the offspring of Adam; whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the spirit. * * * * And this infection of nature doth remain, yea in them that are regenerate.” It is upon this principle that the Liturgy of our Church and her occasional offices are framed. Its truth is distinctly recognized in the selection of the “sentences of the scriptures,” which the minister is required to “read with a loud voice” at the commencement both of morning and evening prayer. If there be a single individual in a congregation of whom it can be said, that he has not *sinned, and come short of the glory of God*,—how can he join in the general Confession—how can he invoke each person of the Godhead separately, and the holy Trinity unitedly, and say, “have mercy upon us miserable sin-

ners,"—how can he adopt the strong language of the general Confession in the Communion Service, and say, "we acknowledge and bewail our manifold sins and wickedness, which we, from time to time, most grievously have committed, * * * * the remembrance of them is grievous unto us; the burden of them is intolerable?" How can he make use even of the Lord's prayer? Or, how can he join in such a petition as this,—“That it may please thee to give us true repentance; to forgive us all our sins, negligences, and ignorances; and to endue us with the grace of thy Holy Spirit, to amend our lives according to thy holy Word?” It is obvious then that the Church of England does not contemplate the existence of any such individual; but, on the other hand, she reminds one and all of her members that—*If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us.*

Whatever, therefore, may be the guilt which we have contracted—whether it be more or less aggravated;—whatever may be the “sins, negligences, and ignorances” with which we stand chargeable,—whether they be sins of omission or of commission, wilful, deliberate, and habitual transgressions, or sins of frailty, infirmity, or surprise; there can be neither peace of mind, nor hope of heaven till they be pardoned. But how is that pardon to be obtained? Doubtless this pardon can be obtained only through the atonement and mediation of our Lord Jesus Christ. Accordingly it is the transcendent excellence of the Church of England that all her formularies—not only her homilies and doctrinal articles—but all her liturgical services have a direct tendency to afford encouragement to the penitent and contrite soul, and to magnify the power and grace of the Saviour. Instead of thwarting the great design of his coming into the world, and on account of which, as we learn from the first page of the New Testament, he was to be called Jesus, by practising any degree of “reserve,” suppression, or concealment, she administers comfort to the weary and heavy-laden sinner, by pointing to *the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.* The Lord Jesus Christ is,

indeed, the *Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last* of all her ministrations. Some evidences of this I shall proceed to adduce.

It may be observed, in general, that the Church, mindful of the assurance of her Lord and Master,—*If ye shall ask any thing in my name I will do it*,—presents all her petitions to the throne of grace in the name and through the mediation of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. But, to descend to particulars: every child who is initiated in the doctrines and duties of Christianity by the Church Catechism, is taught to believe “in God the Son, who hath redeemed him and all mankind.” In the general Confession, we pray, saying,—“Restore thou them that are penitent; according to thy promises declared unto mankind in Christ Jesu our Lord.” In the first of the deprecations of the Litany, we thus pray,—“Spare us, good Lord, spare thy people, whom thou hast redeemed with thy most precious blood, and be not angry with us for ever.” In the obsecrations, we make an exact recital of the different steps by which the work of man’s redemption was accomplished, from its commencement in the mystery of our Saviour’s “holy incarnation,” to its completion in “the coming of the Holy Ghost.” At the close of the intercessory part of the Litany we reiterate our invocation of the glorified Redeemer, and twice address him, saying, “O Lamb of God: that takest away the sins of the world; grant us thy peace;—Have mercy upon us.” In the general Thanksgiving, we express our gratitude to God, not only for “all the blessings of this life; but above all, for his inestimable love in the redemption of the world, by our Lord Jesus Christ.” In the exhortation which is read, when warning is given of the celebration of the Holy Communion, the “meritorious cross and passion of our Saviour” is mentioned as that “whereby ALONE we obtain remission of our sins, and are made partakers of the kingdom of heaven.” Passing over other instances of allusion to the atonement which occur in that truly scriptural and deeply spiritual Communion Service, which the late Mr. Froude coin-

cided with one of his correspondents in regarding "as a judgment on the Church," (vol. i. p. 410., pt. 1st.) but which I consider as one of its most precious deposits, I will only cite a passage from the post-Communion Service. We there beseech our heavenly Father to grant that "by the merits and death of thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in his blood, we and all thy whole Church may obtain remission of their sins, and all other benefits of his passion." Finally, in the concluding scene of life, when the soul is about to wing its flight to the eternal world, we are taught thus to pray, as we have already seen in the fifth number of this Appendix,—“Wash it, we pray thee, in the blood of that immaculate Lamb, that was slain to take away the sins of the world; that whatsoever defilements it may have contracted in the midst of this miserable and naughty world, through the lusts of the flesh, or the wiles of Satan, being purged and done away, it may be presented pure and without spot before thee.” So little sanction does this principle of “reserve” derive from the Liturgy of the Church of England. The adoption of it is rather to be sought for in that apostate Church, which discountenances the free and unrestrained circulation of the scriptures, and compels its members to worship God in an unknown tongue.

That, in the opinion of Dean Comber, the truly penitent believer is authorized to take to himself, without scruple or hesitation, that peace and comfort which the unwavering reception of the great doctrine of the atonement is designed to impart, is evinced by the following extract from his practical Discourse on the Absolution.

“Almighty God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.] There is nothing in the world more desirable than the peace of a good conscience, especially to those who have felt the smart of a conscience disquieted by sin. The pardon of sin, which removes those terrors, is most welcome news to such, and the messengers of it most acceptable, Rom. x. 15., but he that hath been truly humbled, will make a stop (either out of doubting or admiration) when a Nathan is sent from God to tell him of a pardon, 2 Sam. xii. 13.

he wishes it might be according to that word ; only the greatness of his desires awakens some little jealousies, lest the message be too good to be true, and therefore such an one may ask us by what authority we do this ; (Matth. xxi. 23.) we answer we are but deputed servants (Heb. v. 4.) in all we do, much more in this transcendent part of our office, 2 Cor. v. 8. We shew them our commission from Almighty God, whose power none can question, it being a part of his name, Exod. xxxiv. 7., to be the pardoner of iniquity, transgression, and sin, viz., of all sorts, in thought, word, and deed. His laws, indeed, forbid sin, and his word decrees punishment for it ; but this doth not tie his hands, nor take away his privilege to forgive, by which, indeed, he shews himself Almighty, [Αυτοκρατωρ] supreme Lord of all the world, above us and his own laws, so that he can dispense with them. He that bound, can loose without appeal or control, Rev. iii. 7. We come to him who is the offended party, and the Judge, who, if he please to forgive, can do it so fully, that neither men nor devils can call you to a further account, Rom. viii. 33. Now if this term of Almighty prove dreadful, as representing an Almighty Justice who remits not without blood, Heb. ix. 22., so that the poor soul ask, (with Isaac, Gen. xxii. 7, 8.) *Where is the Lamb ?* I answer, God hath provided ; and in the next words, *Behold the Lamb of God*, Jesus Christ ; for this *Almighty God is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*, and in him the Father of mercies and God of all comforts, 2 Cor. i. 3. He is satisfied with that all-sufficient sacrifice, so that now he can be just and yet forgive us, 1 John i. 9. He that sends us, can pardon by his supremacy easily, may do it by his covenant in Christ Jesus justly, will do it through his love in him certainly. And now methinks the pious man should be transported with ecstasies of reverence and love ; reverence to this mighty God, love to this merciful Father. Behold that glorious God whose anger thou hast provoked, and whose commissions for thy final ruin were issuing out to be executed by the destroying angel ; he is now the Father of Jesus, and for his

sake, and at his entreaty, hath sealed thy pardon, and cancelled that warrant signed for thy execution, Ezek. xviii. 4, and sent thee a full and free absolution by the hands of a Messenger of Peace; what posture is lowly enough to receive it? what love great enough to return for it? O blessed change! Now thou seest what Jesus hath done for thee; look not so much at the hand that brings it, as the power that sent it, and the merits that purchased it. So shall thy faith be firm, thy comfort sweet, and thy peace durable; so that nothing but wilful renewed affronts against him that sent it can alter thy pardon, abate thy joy, or disturb thy happy peace.”—Comber’s Companion to the Temple. Part i. § iii. p. 46.

No. 10.

DR. PUSEY, in his Tract “entitled Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism,” (1st edit. p. 166) enters into a lengthened inquiry with regard to the meaning of this very important verse. He begins his disquisition with denouncing the generally, if not universally, received interpretation of it, and concludes with substituting another of his own, which I know not how to characterize by any other term than that of—puerile. He observes that “St. John saith peremptorily and absolutely *doth not commit sin*, and to substitute for this—‘is not guilty of deliberate sin,’ or, ‘gross sin,’ or any other qualifying expression, is clearly tampering with God’s words, and lowering his teaching.” The ultimate conclusion which he deduces is, that “every one AS FAR as he is born again, or the child of God, *doth not commit sin*.”

The obvious objection to this conclusion, and that which instantly betrays its weakness, is that to be *born of God*, or to be *the child of God*, admits of no degrees. A man must be absolutely either a child of God, or a child of Satan—either in a regenerate or an unregenerate state. For, as it is added in the

very next verse, *In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil: whosoever doth not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother.* Doubtless the evidence of a man's being *a child of God* admits of various degrees, as there are various degrees of holiness or fruitfulness in good works. But to affirm that "every one AS FAR as he is born, or the child of God, *doth not commit sin*" seems to me to be, either a proposition devoid of meaning, or to contain a mere truism equivalent to this—every one is regenerate as far as he is regenerate.

In the third extract which I have made from Mr. Pearson's work, it is very justly observed that "the discourses of our Lord contain the SEEDS of all those great doctrines, which are fully illustrated and explained in subsequent revelations." The truth of this observation may be confirmed by passages in the gospels, which relate to the distinctive marks of the regenerate and of the unregenerate character. Besides that one which I cited in the Charge from Matt. vii., is not this distinction clearly indicated in the following words addressed by our blessed Lord to the Pharisees in Matt. xii. 34, 35? *O generation of vipers, how can ye, being evil, speak good things? for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh. A good man out of the good treasure of the heart bringeth forth good things: and an evil man out of the evil treasure bringeth forth evil things.* To the same effect are the words of St. James, (iii. 11, 12) *Doth a fountain send forth at the same place sweet water and bitter? Can the fig-tree, my, brethren, bear olive berries? either a vine figs? so can no fountain both yield salt water and fresh.*

Again, in that remarkable discourse which our blessed Lord held with the Pharisees, recorded in John viii., at the 34th verse, he said, *whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin*,—at the 36th verse, *If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed.* Does not the servitude of sin in the former verse, clearly describe an unregenerate state, and the emancipation from it

announced in the latter, with the same of distinctness indicate a regenerate state ?

And here it is especially deserving of the reader's attention that Whitby, in his annotations on 1 John iii. 8, 9, expressly refers to both these texts in illustration of it. His words are these, "*He that committeth sin*, i.e. he that lives or goes on in any way of sin. That this is the true import of this phrase in the writings of this Apostle, will appear from the same phrase used in his gospel, *Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin*, John viii. 34. Now to be the servant of sin is plainly to continue and to live in it; *to yield obedience to it in the lusting of it*, Rom. vii. 12, for then *sin reigns in our mortal bodies*. Ibid. * * * * *

* * But he that *he is born of God cannot* (thus) *sin*, because by that new birth, he is made free from the service of sin, John viii. 36, and become *a servant of righteousness*, Rom. v. 18. 'He hath that seed within him which alienates his mind and his affections from sin, and that Spirit which causes him to mortify the deeds of the flesh, Rom. viii. 13, to die to sin, and to live to God.'

But, there is no passage in which the contrast between the regenerate and the unregenerate state is exhibited by the Divine Author of our holy religion in a more definite and emphatic manner than in these words addressed to Nicodemus: *That which is born of the flesh, is flesh ; and that which is born of the Spirit, is spirit*. This may almost be regarded as a text upon which St. Paul is taught by the Spirit to enlarge in Rom. viii. 1—16. The manner in which it is there expanded furnishes indeed a striking illustration of the truth of Mr. Pearson's remark cited above. The fifth verse corresponds with it in a most peculiar manner, not only conveying the same weighty truth, but also retaining exactly the same antithetical form: *For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh ; but they that are after the Spirit the things of the Spirit*. These words are thus briefly paraphrased by Bishop Hall ; "For they that are merely natural and carnal men, do mind and affect earthly and carnal matters ; but

they that are regenerate and spiritual, mind and affect holy, spiritual, heavenly things."

The opinions which I have advanced both in this article and in the Charge upon this subject, are confirmed to their utmost extent both by Dr. Hammond and by Bishop Sanderson. But before I cite these authorities, I will here remark that Mr. Slade adopts that interpretation of 1 John iii. 9. which Dr. Pusey not only rejects, but likewise stigmatizes as "clearly tampering with God's words;" and that Whitby explains the phrase,—*born of God*, without making any allusion to baptism. Mr. Slade remarks, upon the words *cannot sin*, that "Raphel and Doddridge cite many instances to shew that the phrase *οὐ δύναται* is sometimes used with great latitude. But it should be likewise observed, that the word *sin* is so used several times in this epistle, denoting a wilful and habitual indulgence in sin. And in this sense it is true, that a child of God, while he continues such, cannot possibly sin; because he that deliberately and habitually 'allows himself' in the commission of evil, cannot be *born of God*." Upon this phrase (*viz. born of God*) Whitby thus expresses himself,—“By the Spirit and the word, John iii. 6. 8, James i. 18, 1 Pet. i. 23. That is, he is preserved from and hath his heart framed into an hatred and loathing of sin. (1.) From the word of God treasured up in his heart, demonstrating to him the vileness of sin that he may hate it, the danger of it that he may fly from it; *I have hid thy word in my heart that I might not sin against thee*. Ps. cxix. 11. And by attending to it as his rule, and taking heed to his ways according to his word. Ibid. v. 9. (2.) By the Holy Spirit abiding in him, as a new principle of life lusting against the flesh, so that we cannot do the things which that would have us to do.”

With regard to the two following quotations, it may be observed that the one from Hammond's Practical Catechism relates specifically to the difficulty contained in 1 John iii. 9; and that the other from Bishop Sanderson, though taken from a sermon

preached upon a different passage of scripture, is intimately connected with the subject, which has been here briefly discussed.

“Scholar. But what? are no sins compatible with a regenerate state?

“Catechist. Yes. 1. Sins of infirmity; 2. of ignorance, and (under the head of infirmity); 3. sins of sudden surreption; and 4. such as by daily incursion of temptations (though constantly resisted, yet) through the length of the work, and our frailty, and Satan’s vigilance sometimes are gained from us: all these (together with those which 5. through levity of the of the matter insensibly steal from us) are, by general repentance, (i.e. humbling ourselves before God for them, begging God’s pardon in Christ, and labouring against them more diligently for the future) reconcileable with a regenerate state; these are spots, but those spots of sons, though they be never totally overcome in this life. 6. Some one wilful act of deliberate sin, which we might have resisted, if it be presently retracted with contrition and confession, and re-inforcing of our resolution with vigilance against it, and so not favoured or indulged unto, may be also reconcileable with a regenerate state so far, as not wholly to *quench the Spirit* of God, to cause spiritual desertion, though it do grieve that Spirit, waste the conscience, wound the soul, and provoke God’s displeasure, (from which nothing but hearty repentance can deliver us) and commonly bring some temporal judgment upon us.

“Scholar. What then are unreconcilable with a regenerate state?

“Catechist. Whatsoever are not compatible with an honest heart, a sincere endeavour; particularly these two, hypocrisy and custom of any sin. *Whatsoever is born of God doth not commit sin*, 1 John iii. 9. (i.e. doth not *live* in sin as in a trade of course) *for his seed remaineth in him*; (there is in the regenerate a new principle or seed of life, a principle of cognation with God, which whilst it continues in him, is still a hazening him out of sin) *and he cannot sin in such manner: because he is born*

of God: or if he do, he is no longer a *child of God*, or regenerate person: or, as St. Paul saith, Gal. v. 16. *Walk in the Spirit, and you shall not fulfil the lusts of the flesh*, i.e. these two are unreconcilable; as when we say, an honest man can not do this or that, our meaning is not to affirm any natural impossibility, that he is not able, but that he cannot think fit to do it; the principles of honesty within him, as here the *seed of God*, or new principle in him, will resist it; or if he do it, he is no longer to be accounted an honest man.

“Scholar. This place in St. John’s Epistle hath sure great difficulty, I beseech you to make it as intelligible to me as you may.

“Catechist. I shall do it, and that most clearly, by bringing down the sense of the whole chapter from the beginning to this place, in this brief Paraphrase; do you look upon the words in your bible, whilst I do it. Ver. 1. *God’s love to us is very great in that he hath accepted us Christians to be his children* (which, by the way, is the reason that the world which rejected Christ, rejecteth us also.) ver. 2. *And being children, though we know not exactly the future benefit which shall accrue to us by this means, yet this we know, that when this shall be revealed to us, we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is, and that vision will assimilate us unto him.* Ver. 3. *And the very hope of it now, if it be fastened on God, hath the same power of making us pure, as he is pure.* For 1. *Hope* includes desire and love of the thing hoped for, which being heaven, a place of purity, the hope of heaven must include a desire of purity; and therefore the heaven that the sensual man desires, if he desire it for the present, is a mock heaven; and if it be the true heaven, the state of purity, then he desires it not for the present, but hereafter when sensual pleasures shall have forsaken him. And 2. the condition of God’s promises being our purification or sanctification, and the particular condition of this *seeing God* being *holiness*, it is madness for us to hope any thing

but upon those grounds ; and therefore he that hath *this hope of seeing him, or being like him* hereafter, labours to become like him now in *purity*, (a special imitable quality of his). And (ver. 4.) *he that wants it*, (i.e. every one that committeth sin) is *guilty of the breach of the law, of this evangelical law of his ; and that sin itself is that breach, upon which consequently follows the forfeiture of those promises contained in it* (Ver. 5.) *And to that end, that we, for whom Christ died, should not thus sin, it was without doubt that he came amongst us ; and sin or any such impenitent committer of sin is not in him.* (Ver. 6.) *For every one that remaineth in him, as a member of his, sinneth not wilful deliberate sins : if any man do so, pretend or profess what he will, he hath neither seen nor known Christ.* (Ver. 7.) *I pray, suffer not yourselves to be deceived. Christ you know is righteous, and the way to be like him is to be righteous also ; and that cannot be but by doing righteousness, living a constant Christian life.* (Ver. 8.) *He that does not so, but goes on in a course of sin, is of the devil, and by his actions expresses the stock he comes of. For it is the devil that began his age with sin, and so continued it, and so sin is his trade, his work ; and this was a special part of the end of Christ's coming ; to destroy his trade, to dissolve that fabric he had wrought, i.e. to turn sin out of the world.* (Ver. 9.) *And therefore sure no child of God's, none of that superior stock will go on in that accursed trade, because he hath God's seed in him, that original of cognation between God and him, God's grace, that principle of his new birth, which gives him continual dislikes to sin, such as* (though they do not force or constrain him not to yield to Satan's temptations, yet) *are sufficient to get him out of those snares ; and if he be a child of God, of Christ's making, like him that begat him in purity, he cannot, he will not thus go on in sin.* (Ver. 10.) *So that hereby you may clearly distinguish a child of God from a child of the devil : he that doth not live a righteous and charitable life, (do justice, and*

love mercy, as Micah saith) is no child of God's, hath no relation of consanguinity to him. I shall need proceed no farther ; by this you will understand the sense of the verse to be this, and no more: Those that are like Christ, and so God's children, it is supposed that they have such a seed or principle of grace in them, that inclines them to dislike, and enables them to resist all deliberate sins ; and if they do not make that use of that grace sure they are not like Christ, none of his fellow sons of God : a regenerate man remaining such, will not, nay morally can not, do so ; so doing is contrary to a regenerate state."—Hammond's Works, vol. i. p. 22.

Bishop Sanderſon, in a Sermon on Gal. v. 22, 23, after having adverted to the various acceptations of the term *spirit*, thus proceeds, "To come up close to the point, (for I fear I have kept off too long) as they stand here opposed, by flesh I take to be clearly meant, the natural corruption of man ; and by spirit, the supernatural grace of God. Even as the same words are also taken in some other places : as, namely, in that saying of our Saviour, Job iii. *That which is born of the flesh, is flesh ; and that which is born of the Spirit, is Spirit.* Which words may serve as a good commentary upon this part of the text ; for they do not only warrant the interpretation, but afford us also the reason of it, under the analogy of a twofold birth or generation. The generation, whether of plants or living creatures, is effectual by that prolific virtue which is in the seed. Answerable, therefore, unto the twofold birth, spoken of in the scriptures, there is also a twofold seed. The first birth is that of the old man, by natural generation, whereby we are born the sons of Adam : the second birth is that of the new man, by spiritual regeneration, whereby we are born the sons of God. Answerably whereunto the first seed is Semen Adæ, the seed of old Adam, derived unto us by carnal propagation from our natural parents, who are therefore called the fathers of our flesh ; together wherewith is also derived that uncleanness or corruption, which upon our first birth

cleaveth so inseparably to our nature, and is the inward principle, from which all the works of the flesh have their emanation. But then there is another seed, *Semen Dei*, as St. John calleth it, the seed of the second Adam, Jesus Christ, God blessed for ever, derived unto us by the communication of his Holy Spirit inwardly renewing us ; together wherewith is also derived a measure of inherent supernatural grace, as the inward principle, whence all these choice fruits of the Spirit do flow.

“ So that upon the whole matter, these two points are clear. First, clear it is, that all the wicked practices recited and condemned in the foregoing verses, with all other of like quality, do proceed merely from the corruption that is in us, from our own depraved minds and wills, without any the least co-operation of the Holy Spirit of God therein. It cannot stand with the goodness of God to be the principal, and neither with his goodness nor greatness, to be an accessory in any sinful action. He cannot be either the author, or the abettor of any thing that is evil. Whoso therefore hath committed any sin, let him take heed he do not add another and a worsen to it, by charging God with it : rather let him give God and his Spirit the glory, by taking all the blame and shame of it to himself and his own flesh. All sinful works are works of the flesh.

“ Secondly, it is clear also, that all the holy affections and performances here mentioned, with all other Christian virtues and graces accompanying salvation not here mentioned ; though wrought immediately by us, and with the free consent of our own wills, are yet the fruit of God’s Spirit working in us. That is to say, they do not proceed originally from any strength of nature, or any inherent power in man’s free-will ; nor are they acquired by the culture of philosophy, the advantages of education, or any improvement whatsoever of natural abilities by the helps of art or industry : but are in truth the proper effects of that supernatural grace, which is given unto us by the good pleasure of God the Father, merited for us by the precious blood of God the Son, and

conveyed into our hearts by the sweet and secret inspirations of God the Holy Ghost. Love, joy, peace, &c. are fruits, not at all of the flesh, but merely and entirely of the Spirit.

“All those very many passages in the New Testament, which either set forth the unframeableness of our nature to the doing of any thing that is good, (*not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think a good thought. In me, that is in my flesh, there dwelleth no good thing*; and the like) or else ascribe our best performances to the glory of the grace of God, (*without me you can do nothing.*’ *All our sufficiency is of God. Not of yourselves; it is the gift of God. It is God that maketh in you both the will and the deed*; and the like) are so many clear confirmations of this truth. Upon the evidence of which truth it is, that our mother the Church hath taught us in the public service to beg at the hands of Almighty God, ‘that he would endue us with the grace of his Holy Spirit, to amend our lives according to his holy word:’ and again, (consonantly to the matter we are now in hand with, almost in terminis) that he would give to all men ‘increase of grace to hear meekly his word, and to receive it with pure affection, and to bring forth the fruits of the Spirit.’ As without which grace it were not possible for us to amend our lives, or to bring forth such fruits, according as God requireth in his holy word.

“And the reason is clear: because as the tree is, such must the fruit be. Do men look to *gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles*? Or can they expect from a salt fountain other than brackish water? Certainly, what is born of flesh, can be no better than flesh. *Who can bring a clean thing out of that which is unclean*? Or how can any thing that good is proceed from a heart, all the *imaginations of the thoughts whereof are only and continually evil*? If we would have the fruit good, reason will (and our Saviour prescribeth the same method) that order be taken, first to make the tree good.”—Bishop Sanderson’s Sermons, 2nd Part, p. 239.

No. 11.

THERE is a Sermon by Bishop Beveridge on the first part of the verse to which this number of the Appendix refers, which for its depth, its comprehensiveness, its searching nature, and the soundness of its doctrines, is not, I am inclined to believe, to be surpassed by any one that has ever been published. I will here insert some extracts from it, which those who are conversant with the writings of the Reformers, and with the Oxford Tract system, will concur with me in thinking as much in harmony with the former, as they are irreconcilably at variance with the latter.

"If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature. In which words we shall first consider the terms, and then the truth asserted in them: the terms to be explained are two, as in all such propositions, the subject and the predicate, *what it is to be in Christ*, and then, *what it is to be a new creature*. As for the first, it is a phrase which the Holy Ghost delights often to use; and therefore I could never persuade myself, but that there is something particular and more remarkable in it, than what is commonly taken notice of: I shall not recite the many places where it occurs, but such only from whence the meaning of it may be gathered. *There is therefore*, saith the apostle, *now, no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus*, Rom. viii. 1, from whence we may conclude, that they are said to be in Christ, who are not only in his church, but in his person, so as to be really vested and interested in him, in his merits, for the pardon of their sins, and in his righteousness, whereby they may be justified, or accounted righteous before God; for otherwise they could not but be condemned. To the same purpose, the same apostle having recounted his own privileges and righteousness which he had in the law, he saith, *But what things were gain to me, those things I counted loss for Christ: yea, doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the know-*

ledge of Christ Jesus my Lord; for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung, that I may win Christ, and be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, Phil. iii. 7, 8, 9. Where we may observe, that he reckons his being in Christ, no common or ordinary thing, but the greatest blessing he could ever have, and he expresseth it several ways; first, by his winning Christ, *ἵνα χριστὸν κερδήσω*, that I may win or gain Christ to myself, that he may be mine, my Saviour, my Redeemer, my Lord, as he here calls him: and then he adds, *That I may be found in him.* In him! How! by having his righteousness; that I may be *found*, saith he, *in him, not having mine own righteousness, but that which is through the faith of Christ.* Which shews plainly, that he desired to be found in Christ, so as to have the righteousness of Christ to be his righteousness, that he might be accounted righteous by it; which could not be, unless it was his own: and therefore by being in Christ, he can mean nothing less than such an union to him, whereby a man is reckoned as one with him, and so hath a real interest in whatsoever is in him.

“There are many such places in the holy scriptures, whereby this notion of our being in Christ might be confirmed; but I shall rather chuse at present to explain it by that similitude which Christ himself is pleased to make use of for that purpose, where he saith to his disciples, *Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine, no more can ye, except ye abide in me. I am the vine, ye are the branches, John xv. 4, 5.* From whence it appears, that we are said to be in Christ, as a branch is in the vine; but a branch is so in the vine, as to be really a part or member of it, and to partake of all the nourishment, the sap, and juice, and whatsoever is in the stock, it is by secret conveyances carried into the branches, so that each branch hath so much of it as it can hold, and as is necessary to preserve its life, and make it

fruitful: and therefore according to this, which is Christ's own similitude, all that are in him, are so in him, as to participate of whatsoever is in him, so far as they are capable of it. But, you will say, perhaps the branch is naturally in the vine, so as to spring out of it, but we are not so in Christ, and therefore the analogy doth not hold good; but the apostle clears this difficulty, by shewing that we are in Christ, as a branch is in a tree, that is, not naturally propagated with it, but inoculated and grafted into it; *And if some, saith he, of the branches be broken off, and thou being a wild olive-tree, wert grafted in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive-tree*, Rom. xi. 17. Now, as we take a scyon of one tree, and graft it into the stock of another, by that incision it soon becomes of the same body with that into which it was grafted, as if it had naturally sprouted from it, and partakes, as the apostle speaks, of the *root and fatness* of the stock, as much as the natural branches do: so here, by nature we are all of the old stock, the wild olive, *Adam*; God, *the husbandman*, as our Saviour calls him in this very case, he cuts off from the old stock, and grafts us *into Christ, the true vine*: by which means we are, as it were, incorporated into him, and so partake of what is in him, as much as if we had proceeded from him, as we did from the first man, and in some sense more; forasmuch as we are joined to *Adam* only by nature, but to Christ by the Holy Spirit himself: for, as the apostle saith, *He that is joined to the Lord, is one spirit*, 1 Cor. vi. 17, which must needs be the highest kind of union that can be imagined. In short, take it thus; our whole nature, and so we ourselves, who are of it, being in the first *Adam*, we were really concerned in every thing that he did, or that was done to him; we sinned in him, we were corrupted in him, we were cursed and condemned in him; and so Christ also having taken our whole nature upon him, and being thereby become, as he is called, the second, or another *Adam*, as all are capable of it, so they who are really in him, are really concerned and interested

in all that he did or suffered in our nature; *in him* they are sanctified, *in him* they fulfilled all righteousness, *in him* they suffered the death which God had threatened against them; and so in him they are absolved from their sins, and justified before God.

“But is there nothing required on our parts, in order to our being thus taken out of the first, and put into the second man, even Christ, so as to be found in him? Yes, doubtless, it is required that we truly believe in him; for he himself saith, that *whosoever believeth in him shall not perish, but have everlasting life*, John iii. 16, and therefore they who do not *believe in him*, must needs perish; which they would not do if they were in him; and they who do believe in him, must needs be in him, otherwise they could not have everlasting life, that being to be had only in him; whereas by believing in him, they partake of him, and in him of all things necessary in order to it: for, as the apostle saith, *we are made partakers of Christ, if we hold the beginning of our confidence stedfast unto the end*, Heb. iii. 14, that is, if we begin and continue stedfastly to believe God and trust in Christ, we are thereby made partakers of him, and interested in him. And he who is thus in Christ, as the apostle here saith, is *a new creature*.

“But *a new creature*, how can that be? as *Nicodemus* said, how can a man be *born when he is old*? so many others say, with more shew of reason, can a thing that is once created, be created again? no surely, not as to the substance or essence of it, that cannot be created again; but, howsoever, the form and qualities of it may be so changed and altered, that it may be quite another thing than what it was at first created, and therefore may be properly called a *new creature*. As the body of a man, at first, was not properly created or produced out of nothing, but was made of the dust of the ground, which was created before, yet it being formed by God out of that dust, and inspired with the breath of life, he is properly called God's creature: so although a man's soul and body are not raised again out of nothing, yet,

if he be raised out of a state of sin, and inspired with the Holy Spirit of God himself, he may be as truly said to be a *new creature*, this being so great a change, that he is altogether another man than what he was before, for he is now *transformed by the renewing of his mind*, Rom. xii. 2. *Yea*, as the apostle saith in my text, *old things are past away, behold all things are become new*. Though he be the same person he was before, yet he doth not understand, or judge, or think, or will, or affect, or speak, or act as he did before. . He hath now a new sense of things, a new judgment, new desires, new hopes, new fears, new loves, new hatred, new joys, new griefs, and so leads a new life ; for he hath *put off the old man, with his deeds, and hath put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge, after the image of him that created him*, Col. iii. 9, 10, or, as it is elsewhere expressed, *He hath put on the new man, which, after God, is created in righteousness and true holiness*, Eph. iv. 24. Where we may observe, that as man was at first, so this new man, *created again after God, or after the image of God, consisting in righteousness and true holiness ;* which is the proper form of *the new man*, and from whence he may therefore be properly called a *new creature*. But for our clearer understanding of this, it will be necessary to take a short view of a man in both his states, in his unregenerate and his regenerate state, as he was born at first, and as he is born again ; or, if ye will, as he is in the *first*, and as he is in the *second Adam* : by which we may easily discern what a mighty change is wrought in him, and how properly he may therefore be called a *new creature*."

But to make it still more plain, we must consider, that Christ is the eternal, the only-begotten Son of God, and therefore they who are *in him*, by a quick and lively faith, they also *in him* are made the sons of God. *For as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe in his name*, John i. 12. And if they be the sons of God, they are *born again* of God himself ; if born again, they are *new*

men ; and if born again of God the Creator, they must needs be *new creatures*, and lead new lives, as being acted by the same spirit by which they were born again, the spirit of God himself ; which by means of their union to Christ, and being made members of his body, is infused into them, and becomes a principle of new life in them whereby they are enabled to answer the full character of a *new creature*, much better than I have or can express it. And therefore we may well conclude with the apostle, that *if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature.*"

"Again, we may observe from hence, that as he who is not *in Christ*, is not a *new creature* ; so on the other side, he who is not a *new creature*, is not *in Christ* : for the apostle saith expressly, *If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature.* And therefore men may pretend what they will, and make what shew they can of *Christ's* religion, they may be baptised into his name, and continue members of his church : they may profess to believe in him as their only Saviour, to serve and honour him as their lord and master : they may undertake to argue and dispute for him, to vindicate and defend him against his enemies : they may pray unto him, they may read and hear his word, they may admire his divine sayings, they may reverence his ministers, they may approach to his very table ; and yet after all, unless they become *new creatures*, they have nothing to do with him : they do not truly believe, and so have no part or interest in him. For they are not *in him*, and so have no ground to expect anything at all from him.

"Howsoever, to excite you the more to it, I desire you to consider also, on the other hand, how happy they are who are *in Christ*, who are taken out of the first, and made true members of the second *Adam*, who in him are created unto good works, and so made *new creatures* ; these are as happy as the other are miserable, as happy as God himself can make them ; for in that they are *in Christ*, in him they have all things that can any way possibly conduce to make them happy. In him they have infinite

merit, whereby their sins are all pardoned and done away, as if they had never been guilty of any : in him they have most perfect righteousness, whereby they are truly accounted righteous by the most righteous judge of the whole world : in him they have all the graces of God's Holy Spirit to make them like himself, holy in all manner of conversation : in him they have wisdom to direct them in all their ways, and power to protect them against all their enemies : in him Almighty God himself is well pleased with them, and become their friend, yea, their most loving and indulgent father : in him they have all the blessings that he hath purchased for them with his own most precious blood ; that is, all they can ever want or desire to make them completely blessed." —Bishop Beveridge's Sermons, vol. 1, pp. 162, 167, 168, 170.

No. 12.

I AM aware that the pronoun *that*, in Eph. ii. 8, which is cited in this Charge may refer, not to *faith* exclusively, but to the whole of the first member of the text. It will appear, however, from one of the extracts from the Homilies of our Church, which I purpose inserting in this number, that our Reformers considered it as referring to faith. Whether this opinion be correct, or not, the passages which I am about to adduce, will testify that according to their deliberate convictions, not only eternal salvation itself, but all the graces that lead to it and that qualify the soul for it, are the free gift of God, and flow from the inexhaustible fountain of his unmerited goodness and mercy.

"St. Paul declareth nothing here upon the behalf of man concerning his justification, but only a true and lively faith, which nevertheless is the gift of God, and not man's only work without God." Homilies, p. 19, 8vo.

"Finally, St. Paul maketh a plain argument in this wise, *If our heavenly Father would not spare his own Son, but did give*

him to death for us; how can it be but that with him he should give us all things? Therefore, if we have Christ, then have we with him and by him, all good things whatsoever we can in our hearts wish or desire, as victory over death, sin and hell; we have the favour of God, peace with him, holiness, wisdom, justice, power, life, and redemption; we have by him perpetual health, wealth, joy, and bliss everlasting," p. 77.

"We are evidently taught in God's holy Testament, that Almighty God is the only fountain and well-spring of all goodness; and that whatsoever we have in this world, we receive it only at his hands. To this effect serveth the place of St. James, *Every good and perfect gift, saith he, cometh from above, and proceedeth from the Father of lights.* To this effect also serveth the testimony of Paul, in divers places of his Epistles, witnessing that the spirit of wisdom, the spirit of knowledge and revelation, yea, every good and heavenly gift, as faith, hope, charity, grace, and peace, cometh only and solely of God," p. 272.

"Two things are chiefly to be respected in every good and godly man's prayer;—his own necessity, and the glory of Almighty God. Necessity belongeth either outwardly to the body, or else inwardly to the soul. Which part of man, because it is much more precious and excellent than the other, therefore we ought first of all to crave such things as properly belong to the salvation thereof; as the gift of repentance, the gift of faith, the gift of charity and good works, remission and forgiveness of sins, patience in adversity, lowliness in prosperity, and such other like fruits of the Spirit, as hope, love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, meekness, and temperance; which things God requireth of all them who profess themselves to be his children," p. 279.

"I promised you to declare that all spiritual gifts and graces come specially from God. Let us consider the truth of this matter, and hear what is testified first of the gift of faith, the first entry into a Christian life, without the which no man can please

God. For St. Paul confesseth it plainly to be God's gift, saying, *Faith is the gift of God,*" (Eph. ii. 8, the text cited in the Charge.) "And, again, St. Peter saith, *It is of God's power that ye be kept through faith to salvation.* It is of the goodness of God that we faulter not in our hope unto him. It is verily God's work in us the charity wherewith we love our brethren. If after our fall we repent, it is by him that we repent, which reacheth forth his merciful hand to raise us up. If we have any will to rise, it is he that preventeth our will, and disposeth us thereto. If after contrition we feel our consciences at peace with God through remission of our sin, and so be reconciled again to his favour, and hope to be his children and inheritors of everlasting life; who worketh these great miracles in us?—Our worthiness, our deservings and endeavours, our wits and virtue?—Nay verily, St. Paul will not suffer flesh and clay to presume to such arrogancy, and therefore saith, *All is of God, which hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ. For God was in Christ when he reconciled the world unto himself.* God, the Father of all mercy, wrought this high benefit unto us, not by his own person, but by a mean, by no less a mean than his own beloved Son, whom he spared not from any pain and travail that might do us good. For upon him he put our sins, and upon him he laid our ransom; him he made the mean betwixt us and himself, whose mediation was so acceptable to God the Father, through his absolute and perfect obedience, that he took his act for a full satisfaction of all our disobedience and rebellion, whose righteousness he took to weigh against our sins, whose redemption he would have stand against our damnation."—p. 411.

"Let us therefore meekly call upon that bountiful Spirit the Holy Ghost, which proceedeth from the Father of mercy, and from our Mediator Christ, that he would assist us, and inspire us with his presence, that in him we may be able to hear the goodness of God declared unto us to our salvation. For without his lively and secret inspiration can we not once so much as speak

the name of our Mediator, as St. Paul plainly testifieth;—*No man can once name our Lord Jesus Christ but in the Holy Ghost.* Much less should we be able to believe and know these great mysteries that be opened to us by Christ. St. Paul saith, that *no man can know what is of God but the Spirit of God.* As for us, saith he, *we have received not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God;* for this purpose; *that in that Holy Spirit we might know the things that be given us by Christ.* * * * * * To hold the way which God hath prepared for us to walk rightly in our journey, we must acknowledge that it is in the power of his Spirit, which helpeth our infirmity. That we may boldly come in prayer, and call upon Almighty God as our Father, it is by this Holy Spirit which maketh intercession for us with continual sighs. If any gift we have, wherewith we may work to the glory of God, and profit of our neighbour, all is wrought by his own and self-same Spirit, which maketh his distributions peculiarly to every man as he will. If any wisdom we have, it is not of ourselves, we cannot glory therein, as begun of ourselves; but we ought to glory in God from whom it came to us, as the Prophet Jeremiah writeth, *Let him that rejoiceth, rejoice in this, that he understandeth and knoweth me; for I am the Lord, which shew mercy, judgment, and righteousness in the earth; for in these things I delight, saith the Lord.* This wisdom cannot be attained, but by the direction of the Spirit of God, and therefore it is called spiritual wisdom. And no where can we more certainly search for the knowledge of this will of God, (by the which we must direct all our works and deeds) but in the holy scriptures, *for they be they that testify of him,* saith our Saviour Christ. It may be called knowledge and learning, that is other where gotten without the word: but the wise man plainly testifieth that *they all be but vain, which have not in them the wisdom of God.* We see to what vanity the old philosophers came, who were destitute of this science, gotten and searched for in his word. WE SEE WHAT

VANITY THE SCHOOL-DOCTRINE IS MIXED WITH, FOR THAT IN THIS WORD THEY SOUGHT NOT THE WILL OF GOD, BUT RATHER THE WILL OF REASON, THE TRADE OF CUSTOM, THE PATH OF THE FATHERS, THE PRACTICE OF THE CHURCH. Let us, therefore, read and revolve the holy scripture both day and night, for *blessed is he that hath his whole meditation therein*. It is that which giveth wisdom to the simple and ignorant. In it may we find eternal life. In the holy scriptures find we Christ, in Christ find we God: for he it is that is the express image of the Father. He that seeth Christ, seeth the Father. And contrariwise, as St. Jerome saith, the ignorance of the scripture, is the ignorance of Christ. NOT TO KNOW CHRIST, IS TO BE IN DARKNESS, IN THE MIDST OF OUR WORLDLY AND CARNAL LIGHT OF REASON AND PHILOSOPHY. To be without Christ, is to be in foolishness: for he is the only wisdom of the Father, in whom it pleased him that all fulness and perfection should dwell."—p. 413—415.

No. 13.

IN the first number of this Appendix it has been seen that Bishop Warburton founded a Lecture for the express purpose of proving "the truth of revealed religion, in general, and of the Christian in particular, from the completion of the prophecies in the Old and New Testament, which relate to the Christian Church, ESPECIALLY TO THE APOSTASY OF PAPAL ROME." It is evident, therefore, that, in the judgment of this learned prelate, whoever attempted to vindicate the Church of Rome from the charge of this apostasy, and to transfer the guilt of it to some visionary creation of their own fancy which has not yet made its appearance in the world, would not only, by so doing, aid and abet the cause of that apostate Church, but would be

detracting in the same proportion from the evidence of the truth of the Christian religion. Whether the writer of the eighty-third Tract (entitled "Advent Sermons on Antichrist") has not incurred this responsibility, shall be left to the impartial reader to judge when he has perused this number.

It is not my intention to expose all the fallacies, or to refute all the errors, which pervade these sermons, and which are so profusely scattered within the narrow compass of fifty-three pages. Such an undertaking would require a volume, instead of a portion of this Appendix. I shall, therefore, confine myself to some of the more prominent points, in most of which the writer has followed closely in the track of the Popish Annotators of Rheims. Where this is the case, I shall confront him with the reply of their acute and learned antagonist,—Dr. Fulke.

The Rhemish Annotators had very substantial reasons for discarding the evidence of history in their interpretation of such predictions as are contained in the second chapter of the second epistle to the Thessalonians, and in the Apocalypse. They could not but be conscious that the records of the nine or ten centuries, which had preceded the time when they wrote, were exceedingly unfavourable to the system which they were solicitous to uphold: it was natural, therefore, that they should prefer the indistinct and glimmering light furnished by the writings of the Fathers, to the clear and palpable light of history. But why any one, who has not a decided predilection for that system, should reject its testimony, as that of "an old almanac," and prefer the guidance of the Fathers, it is not easy to conjecture. Such, however, has been the course pursued by the author of this Tract. In the first page he says that, in reviewing the intimations given us in scripture concerning Antichrist, "he shall follow the exclusive guidance of the ancient Fathers of the Church." For he observes at p. 3, "to say the least, they are as likely to be right as commentators now; in some respects more so, because the interpretation of prophecy has become in these times a matter

of controversy and party. And passion and prejudice have so interfered with soundness of judgment, that it is difficult to say who is to be trusted in it, or whether a private Christian may not be as good an expositor as those by whom the office has been assumed."

This language is such as might be expected to flow from the pen of a Romanist, or of any one to whom, like the late Mr. Froude, Protestantism is "odious." But, supposing that "passion and prejudice" may have "interfered with soundness of judgment" in the present day, or in the time of the Reformers, who were unanimous in denouncing the Pope, or the Popish hierarchy with him at its head, or the Church of Rome, as the Antichrist, still will this writer venture to affirm that Vitringa, and Cocceius, and Mede, and Dr. Henry More, and Sir Isaac Newton, and Bishops Newton, Hurd, and Hallifax, with many other eminent writers, have made the interpretation of prophecy "a matter of controversy and party," because they coincided with the Reformers in regarding the Church of Rome as Antichrist?

To affirm that the ancient Fathers were, "to say the least, as likely to be right as commentators now," is a mere *petitio principii*. It is a gratuitous assumption, that no events have taken place during the last twelve hundred years, which can aid us in the interpretation of the prophecies in question. This may be a very convenient assumption for a Romanist; but it is one which a Protestant will feel disposed stoutly to resist. And here I may appropriately quote Dr. Fulke. The Rhemish Annotators had observed upon the words, *what letteth* (or *what withholdeth*, 2 Thess. ii. 6,) that "St. Augustine professeth plainly that he understandeth not these words, nor that that followeth, of *the mystery of iniquity*, and least of all, that which the apostle addeth:—*only he who now letteth, will let*, &c.; which may humble us all, and stay the confident rashness of wicked heretics

that boldly feign hereof whatsoever is agreeable to their heresy and phantasy." To this Dr. Fulke replies, "So St. Augustine, which saw not the fulfilling of this prophecy, professeth his ignorance, as Irenæus doth in part: yet most of the ancient writers understand this *let* to be the Roman Empire, which so long as it stood, Antichrist could not possess the city of Rome, which was appointed for the seat of his tyranny, nor usurp such dominion as, after that was taken away, he challenged. That we feign nothing upon this text, it is manifest, because we affirm nothing but that which the ancient Fathers have said before us. **ALTHOUGH BECAUSE WE SEE ALL THESE THINGS OPENLY REVEALED, WHICH WERE TO THEM MORE OBSCURE, BECAUSE THEY WERE NOT PERFORMED, WE NOTE THE PERSON MORE BOLDLY, AND CLEARLY WE PRONOUNCE OF THE FULFILLING OF THIS PROPHECY.**"

From some expressions of our Lord's, and from St. Paul's saying, that Antichrist shall be destroyed by the brightness of his coming, the writer deduces this conclusion (p. 4.) "If, then, Antichrist is to come immediately before Christ, and to be the sign of his coming, it is manifest that he is not come yet, but is still to be expected." In support of this conclusion he cites Matt. xxiv. 15, 16. *When ye shall see the abomination of desolation * * * stand in the holy place— * * * then let them which be in Judea flee into the mountains.* Again, at p. 18, he remarks, "Hence, considering that Antichrist would pretend to be the Messiah, it was of old the received notion that he was to be of Jewish race and to observe the Jewish rites. Further; St. Paul says that Antichrist should *sit in the temple of God*, i.e. according to the earlier Fathers, in the Jewish temple. Our Saviour's own words may be taken to support this notion, because he speaks of *the abomination of desolation* (which, whatever other meaning it might have, in its fulness denotes Antichrist) *standing in the holy place.*" Here, likewise,

as the Rhemists and this writer derive their interpretation of prophecy from the same source, they are found in accordance as to the leading events. Upon the words—*in the temple*—the former observe—“Most ancient writers expound this of the temple of Jerusalem, which they think Antichrist shall build up again, as being of the Jews’ stock, and to be acknowledged of that obstinate people for their expected and promised Messias. Not that he shall suffer them to worship God by their old manner of sacrifices (all which he will either abolish, or convert to the only adoration of himself: though at the first, to apply himself to the Jews, he may perhaps be circumcised and keep some part of the law) for it is here said that he shall sit in the temple as God, that is, he shall be adored there by sacrifice and divine honour, the name and worship of the true God being wholly defaced. And this they think to be *the abomination of desolation*, foretold by Daniel, mentioned by our Saviour, prefigured and resembled by Antiochus, and others, that defaced the worship of the true God by profanation of that temple, specially by abrogating the daily sacrifice, which was a figure of the only sacrifice and continual oblation of Christ’s holy body and blood in the church, as the abolishing of that, was a figure of the abolishing of this; which shall be done principally and most universally by Antichrist himself (as now in part by his forerunners) throughout all nations and churches of the world (though then also mass be had in secret, as it is now in nations where the secular force of some princes prohibiteth it to be said openly.) For although he may have his principal seat and honour in the temple and city of Jerusalem, yet he shall rule over the whole world, and specially prohibit that principal work instituted by Christ in his Sacraments, as being the proper adversary of Christ’s person, name, law, and church, the profanation and desolation of which church, by taking away the sacrifice of the altar, is the proper *abomination of desolation*, and the work of Antichrist only.”

To this comment Dr. Fulke thus replies:—“Though some of

the ancient Fathers supposed that Antichrist should sit in the temple of Jerusalem, YET THEY HAD NO REASON OUT OF THE WORD OF GOD SO TO THINK. For the temple of Solomon being utterly destroyed, though another like it should be builded according to this surmise, yet could it not be called the Temple of God. But the Church of Christ is by the apostle called the Temple of God, 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17; 2 Cor. vi. 16; Rev. iii. 12. Wherefore the apostle meaneth, that Antichrist shall sit in the visible Church of God, or that which is so called and commonly reputed: and there usurp divine authority. That *the abomination of desolation* consisteth chiefly in abolishing the Popish mass;—it is a vain presumption, without authority of the scriptures or testimony of the ancient Fathers. For rather the mass is an *abomination* that bringeth *desolation*, because it overthroweth the virtue of the sacrifice and priesthood of Christ, in which is the only comfort of Christian men's consciences."

But I must here insert the Rhemish commentary upon the words of our Lord as they are recorded in St. Matthew's Gospel, chap. xxiv. 15; because Dr. Fulke's answer will shew the estimate which he formed of an authority which is there cited by the Rhemists, and which is also cited no less than four times in his note by the author of the eighty-third Tract, viz. that of "Hippolytus de Antichristo." "*Abomination of desolation*. This abomination of desolation foretold, was partly fulfilled in divers profanations of the Temple of Jerusalem, when the sacrifice and service of God was taken away; but specially it shall be fulfilled by Antichrist and his precursors, when they shall abolish the holy mass, which is the sacrifice of Christ's body and blood, and the only sovereign worship due to God in his church. As St. Hippolytus writeth in these words:—'The churches shall lament with great lamentations, because there shall neither oblation be made, nor incense, nor worship grateful to God. But the sacred houses of churches shall be like to cottages, and the precious body and blood of Christ shall not be extant (openly in churches)

in those days, the liturgy (or mass) shall be extinguished, the psalmody shall cease, the reciting of the scriptures shall not be heard.'—Hippol. de Antichristo.—By which it is plain that the heretics of those days be the special fore-runners of Antichrist."

Dr. Fulke, in answer, replies,—“This Hippolytus was not that ancient martyr of whom St. Jerome writeth, but a later fantastical fellow, full of fables concerning Antichrist;—that he should be no man, but a devil in the shape of man,—that John the Evangelist shall come with Enoch and Elias before the coming of Antichrist,—that Antichrist shall bring devils with him in the shape of angels, and command them to carry him up to heaven, with such like stuff. Yet he doth not expound this *abomination* of the abolishing of the mass, or the sacrifice thereof, nor speaketh of either of them: but flourishing in words as his manner is, foresheweth the abolishing of all Christian religion, which shall never be, for Christ will continue with his Church to the end of the world.”

The *abomination of desolation* is twice predicted by the prophet Daniel, viz: chap. ix. 27, and chap. xii. 11. Upon the latter, Bishop Newton, in a passage which I quoted in the Appendix to a Charge published five years ago, makes the following remarks.—“The *setting up of the abomination of desolation* appears to be a general phrase, and comprehensive of various events. It is applied by the writer of the first book of Numbers (i. 54) to the profanation of the temple by Antiochus, and his setting up the image of Jupiter Olympius upon the altar of God. It is applied by our Saviour (Matt. xxiv. 15) to the destruction of the city and temple by the Romans, under the conduct of Titus, in the reign of Vespasian. It may for the same reason be applied to the Roman emperor, Adrian's building a temple to Jupiter Capitolinus in the same place where the temple of God had stood; and to the misery of the Jews, and the desolation of Judea that followed. It may with equal justice be applied to the Mohammedans invading and desolating Christendom, and con-

verting the churches into mosques: and this latter event seemeth to have been particularly intended in this passage.”—Bishop Newton’s *Dissertations on the Prophecies*, vol. 2, p. 213.

That the words of our Lord, as cited by the author of the eighty-third Tract, must have referred to the former of these two passages, and could contain no possible allusion to Antichrist, either in the east or in the west, is self-evident to any one who will compare Dan. ix. 26, 27, with Matt. xxiv. 15—20. The following short extracts from the writings of Dr. Lightfoot will shew that no passage of scripture was ever more palpably misinterpreted and misapplied than is the fifteenth verse by this follower of the Rhemists.

“*The abomination of desolation* had now begun to *stand in the holy place*, when the temple is made a garrison and filled with slaughter; Antonia, the castle of the temple, besieged, taken, and the Roman garrison put to the sword,—the Tabernæ, or part of the buildings at the east wall of the mountain of the house, (the place where the Sanhedrim had once sitten,) fired and burnt down; and, in a word, the temple, from this time forwards, never but a garrison, and full of slaughter and confusion, till it be raked up in ashes. Now it was time for those who were in Judea, who believed Christ’s prediction, to *flee into the mountains*, &c.”—Lightfoot’s *Works*, vol. 3, p. 325.

“*Whoso readeth, let him understand.* This is not spoken so much for the obscurity, as for the certainty of the prophecy: as if he should say—‘He that readeth those words in Daniel, let him mind well, that, when the army of the prince which is to come, that army of abominations, shall compass round Jerusalem with a siege, then most certain destruction hangs over it. For, saith Daniel, *the people of the prince which is to come, shall destroy the city, &c., the sanctuary, &c., v. 26. And the army of abominations shall make desolate, even until the consummation, and that which is determined shall be poured out upon the desolate.* Flatter not yourselves, therefore,

with vain hopes, either of future victory, or of the retreating of that army; but provide for yourselves; and he that is in Judea, let him fly to the hills and places of most difficult access,—not into the city.’—See how Luke clearly speaks out this sense, in the twentieth verse of the one and twentieth chapter.”—Lightfoot’s Works, vol. 11, p. 298.

I will here introduce another extract from that valuable work of Bishop Hurd’s, of which I have already availed myself in this Appendix; because it will not only throw light upon the symbolical meaning of the word “Temple” in 2 Thess. ii. 4, which by the Popish Annotators, and the author of the eighty-third Tract, is assumed to mean the literal Temple of Jerusalem; but also on the subject of the “Little Horn” of the Prophet Daniel.—“The prophecies,” observes this learned prelate, “seem very clearly to point it (viz: Antichrist) out to us, as an Ecclesiastical, and, in name and pretence, at least, a Christian power.

“To begin again with the prophet, Daniel. He tells us, that the Horn which shall arise after, and from among, the ten horns, that is, the Antichristian kingdom, as before explained, shall be diverse from the ten kingdoms, out of which it shall arise. ‘But a kingdom may be diverse from other kingdoms, in various respects.’ Without doubt. And, therefore, we cannot certainly conclude from this single text, that the diversity, mentioned, will consist in its being a spiritual kingdom. Yet, if ye reflect that this diversity is given as the characteristic mark of the Antichristian kingdom; that, although there may be other and smaller differences between kingdoms, the greatest and most signal is that which subsists between a temporal and spiritual power; nay, that government, as such, is, and can only be, of two sorts, civil and spiritual, as corresponding to the two constituent parts of man, (the subject of all government in this world,) the soul and the body. Taking, I say, these considerations along with you, ye cannot esteem it a very harsh and violent interpretation, if, without looking any farther, we incline

to think that this diversity of regimen, so emphatically pointed out, respects that great and essential difference in human government only. At least, it will be admitted, that, if, from other and more express testimonies, the government of Antichrist appear to be a spiritual government, we shall, then, be authorized to put such a construction on Daniel's prophecy, as will reach the full force and import of his expression. Such a kingdom must be allowed to be eminently diverse from secular kingdoms. So that the harmony between the prophets on this subject will be clear and striking.

"Now, such a testimony we seem to find in the apostle, St. Paul; who, prophesying of the Man of Sin, or Antichrist, to be revealed in the latter days, makes it a distinguishing part of his character, *That he sitteth in the temple of God*. Consider the force of these words. A power, *seated in the temple of God*, can be nothing but a power suitable to that place, or a spiritual power: just as a power, seated in the throne of Cæsar, could only be interpreted of a civil power.

"Nor say, because the context runs thus—'that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God—that therefore it only means his claiming divine honours: a degree of blasphemy, very applicable to a civil power.' This objection has clearly no force: because his *sitting in the temple of God* was the very means (if we rightly apply this prophecy) by which the man of sin rose to that abominable pre-eminence. It was by virtue of his spiritual, that he assumed a divine character. So that the phrase—as *God*—and that other—*shewing himself that he is God*—set before us, indeed, the extravagant height to which the man of sin aspired, and to which he ascended; but, no way invalidates the conclusion from his sitting in the temple of God—that he was a spiritual power. Rather, we see the propriety of this conclusion; because the text, thus understood, suggests the way in which the man of sin accomplished his blasphemous purpose: his success arose, from his station in the

temple. On the other hand, a power *sitting in the throne of Cæsar*, might sit there as God, and might *shew himself that he was God* (as many of the Roman emperors did :) so that the clause—*sitting in the temple of God*—has evidently no peculiar fitness, as applied to the usurpation of divine honours by a civil tyrant; whereas we see it has that fitness, when applied to a spiritual tyrant. The context therefore proves nothing against the interpretation here proposed and defended.

“But, what is this temple of God? The temple at Jerusalem, it will be said; the only temple, so called, then subsisting in the world. Admit this to be the literal sense of the words. Yet ye remember so much of what hath been said concerning the prophetic style, as not to think it strange, that the literal sense should involve in it another, a mystical meaning. And this, without any uncertainty whatsoever. For so, the term, Jew, means a Christian; the term, David, means Christ; the incense of the temple-service, means the prayers of Christians; plainly and confessedly so, in numberless instances. Agreeably to this analogical use of Jewish terms, in the style of the prophets, *the temple of God*, nay, *the temple of Jerusalem* (if that had been the expression) must, in all reason, be interpreted of the Christian church, and could not, in the prophetic language, be interpreted otherwise. When, therefore, Antichrist is said to *sit in the temple of God*, it is the same thing as if it had been said of him, *That he sitteth, or ruleth, in the church of Christ*. Now, substitute these words—*the Church of Christ*—in the room of those other words—*the temple of God*; and see if St. Paul, supposing his purpose had been to express a spiritual power in opposition to a civil; see, I say, if St. Paul could have conveyed that purpose more plainly.”—Bishop Hurd’s Warburtonian Lectures, p. 359.

Another remarkable coincidence must here be noticed between this writer and the Rhemists in connexion with 2 Thess. ii. 4,—a verse upon which I think it necessary to dwell at some length, on account of its importauce in the controversy between Romanists

and Protestants. The Oxford Tract Writer, speaking of Antichrist, says,—“Neither true God, nor false God, will he worship.” The Rhemists,—“Antichrist shall abolish the public exercise of all other religions, true and false.” The Oxford Tract Writer,—“He will set himself forcibly against all idols and idolatry.” The Rhemists,—“He shall pull down all idols of the Gentiles.” I will, however, submit to the reader’s attention extracts more at length from both; together with some parts of Dr. Fulke’s reply.

The author of the eighty-third Tract, at p. 20, puts this question—“Next let us ask, Will Antichrist profess any sort of religious worship at all? Neither true God, nor false God, will he worship: so far is clear, and yet something more and that obscure is told us. Indeed, as far as the prophetic accounts go, they seem at first sight incompatible with each other. Antichrist is to *exalt himself above all that is called God or worshipped*. He will set himself forcibly against idols and idolatry, as the early teachers agree in declaring. Yet in the book of Daniel we read, *In his estate shall he honour the God of forces; and a God whom his fathers knew not shall he honour with gold and silver, and with precious stones, and pleasant things. Thus shall he do in the most strong holds with a strange god, whom he shall acknowledge and increase with glory*. What is meant by the words translated *God of forces*, and afterwards called a *strange god*, is quite hidden from us, and probably will be so till the event: but, any how, some sort of false worship is certainly predicted as the mark of Antichrist, with this prediction the contrary way that he shall set himself against all idols, as well as against the true God.”

Before I insert the intended quotations from the Rhemists and Dr. Fulke, I will make some remarks upon the preceding extract, and confirm them by some passages from the Homily “against peril of idolatry.” So far from there being the alleged apparent “incompatibility” in “the prophetic accounts” of Antichrist, it

arises solely from the erroneous interpretation of the prophecies adopted by the Romanists and their coadjutor, the Oxford Tract Writer. The "early teachers may agree in declaring" that Antichrist "will set himself forcibly against idols and idolatry;" but the event has most emphatically falsified the truth of their declarations. It is, indeed, admitted by this writer that "some sort of false worship is certainly predicted as the mark of Antichrist." But, throughout the whole of his Tract, he very discreetly omits making the slightest reference to 1 Tim. iv. 1—3. If he had consulted Mede's elaborate Treatise on that passage, which Bishop Hurd styles an "exquisite and unanswerable discourse," he would have found one "sort of false worship," which is upheld by the Church of Rome, viz: its dæmonolatry most accurately described, and he would have seen that this "predicted mark of Antichrist" is indelibly stamped upon that apostate church.

Independently, however, of the idolatrous nature and tendency of that dæmonolatry which constitutes one of the distinctive marks of Antichrist, the thirteenth chapter of the Apocalypse clearly predicts that what Mede denominates the "*Bestia Ecclesiastica*" acts in the most intimate union, and with the most active co-operation with what he terms the "*Bestia Secularis*." This is manifest from the eleventh and twelfth verses, when it is said—*And I beheld another beast coming out of the earth; and he had two horns like a lamb, and he spake as a dragon. And he exerciseth all the power of the first beast before him, and causeth the earth and them which dwell therein to worship the first beast, whose deadly wound was healed.* Of the *first beast* it is said that *there was given unto him a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies.* (Rev. xiii. 5.) By these *blasphemies* was meant, according to Mede, idolatrous worship. These are his words as they are translated by Mr. Bransby Cooper from his "*Clavis Apocalyptica*."—"Hitherto of the constitution and state of the beast. It is afterwards explained in what things he exer-

cised the power committed to him by the dragon ; viz : in two,—in blasphemy towards God, and the persecution of the saints. The whole description is taken from the prophecy of Daniel, ch. vii, where he treats of the same subject as here, that is the Roman beast in the last state. But the circumstances which are there related to Daniel by the angel, rather succinctly, are here more diffusively laid open, as in an interjected explanation. *There was given to him* (says he) *a mouth speaking great things. The mouth speaking great things* is Daniel's ; but here the great words are explained by *blasphemies* ; under which name, it will presently be asserted, idolatrous worship was designated, as a matter of the highest affront to God. * * * * * Now, as I said before, that by the name of blasphemy in this place, was designated, as by way of eminence, idolatry, or spiritual fornication, may be evinced by a two fold, or even a three fold argument. First, because Babylon, the metropolis of this beast, means the mother of harlots, and with her the kings and inhabitants of the earth are said to commit whoredom. But the beast of which we treat, is nothing else than the community of those kings and inhabitants. Secondly, it must be a blasphemy of the same kind, which should suit the state of the head immediately preceding ; nay, of all the other heads ; for on all *were written the names of blasphemy*, (v. 1.) Add that this beast of the last state, was born and composed from the renewal of the impiety of his predecessor of the sixth head. But what blasphemy could be ascribed as common to them except idolatry alone ?—Assuredly none. * * * * * *And he opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name, and his tabernacle, and those that dwell in heaven.* What he had before said generally about blasphemy, he here pursues in detail, and distinguishes a triple idolatry of the beast. For first, he blasphemes the name of God ; that is, in the worship of images. Secondly, *his tabernacle* ; that is, the human nature of Christ, in which the Deity hypostatically dwells. * * * * * This tabernacle,

I say, the beast blasphemeth, when he believes the body of Christ to be made every day out of bread, by the transubstantiation of the mass, and therefore worships the bread instead of Christ, the tabernacle of God; nay, looks up to the propitiatory sacrifice offered for the living and the dead, as crucifying Christ anew. He blasphemeth the celestial inhabitants likewise, that is, the angels and saints, who dwell in heaven, whilst in their names he invokes the dæmons and idols which he worships." A Translation of Mede's *Clavis Apocalyptica*. By R. Bransby Cooper, Esq. pp. 314, 316, 320.

I have borrowed thus largely from the rich storehouse of Mede's Works, partly for the purpose of shewing how little ground the author of the eighty-third Tract had for ascribing to "the prophetic accounts" the seeming inconsistency of instituting "some sort of false worship," and at the same time setting "himself against all idols" (an hypothesis directly opposed to the whole tenor of the prophecies); and, partly, in vindication of the language (if it stand in need of vindication) made use of in the extracts from the homily, which I am about to cite.

"The Bishops of Rome, being usurpers of princes' authority, contrary to God's word, were the maintainers of images against God's word, and stirrers up of sedition and rebellion, and workers of continual treasons against their sovereign lords, contrary to God's law, and the ordinances of all human laws, being not only enemies to God, but also rebels and traitors against their princes. These be the first bringers in of images openly into churches. These be the first maintainers of them in the churches; and these be the means whereby they have maintained them; to wit, conspiracy, treason, and rebellion against God and their princes." Homilies, p. 170, 8vo. Again, at p. 187, it is observed, "that images have been and be worshipped in our time, in like form and manner as were the idols of the Gentiles, is now to be proved. And for that idolatry standeth chiefly in the mind, it shall in this part first be proved, that our image-maintainers have had and

have the same opinions and judgment of saints whose images they have made and worshipped, as the Gentile idolators had of their gods. And afterwards shall be declared, that our image-maintainers and worshippers have used and use the same outward rites and manner of honouring and worshipping their images, as the Gentiles did use before their idols; and that, therefore, they commit idolatry, as well inwardly and outwardly, as did the wicked Gentile idolators."—"Thus do our image-maintainers in earnest apply to their images all such miracles, as the Gentiles have feigned of their idols. * * * * * For the scriptures have for a warning hereof foreshewed, *that the kingdom of Antichrist shall be mighty in miracles and wonders, to the strong illusion of all the reprobates*. But in this they pass the folly and wickedness of the Gentiles, that they honour and worship the relics and bones of our saints, which prove that they be mortal men and dead, and therefore no gods to be worshipped, which the Gentiles would never confess of their gods for very shame."—Homilies, p. 195.

But I must now return from this long digression to the Rhemists and Dr. Fulke. The former in their marginal note on 2 Thess. ii. 4, propose this question, "How then can the Pope be Antichrist, as the heretics fondly blaspheme, who is so far from being exalted above God, that he prayeth most humbly not only to Christ, but also to his blessed mother, and all his saints?"—To which Dr. Fulke returns the following answer,—“As an hypocrite he prayeth to Christ and the saints: yet in his blasphemous doctrine and decrees he exalteth himself above all that is called God or worshipped. Even so he calleth himself servant of servants, yet maketh slaves of all kings that will submit themselves under his tyranny, making them to kiss his feet, and to hold his stirrup, and when he rideth in *Pontificalibus*, to wait upon him as his vassals, treading upon the emperors neck, deposing of emperors and kings at his pleasure.”

The Rhemists, in their annotations, give us the following com-

mentary upon the word *exalted*; (2 Thess. ii. 4.)—"The great Antichrist, which must come near the world's end, shall abolish the public exercise of all other religions true and false, and pull down both the blessed sacrament of the altar, wherein consisteth specially the worship of the true God, and also all idols of the Gentiles, and sacrifices of the Jews, generally all kind of religious worship, saving that which must be done to himself alone; which was partly prefigured in such kings as protested that no God nor man but themselves should be prayed unto for certain days, as Darius and such like. How can the Protestants then for shame, and without evident contradiction, avouch the Pope to be Antichrist, who (as we say) honoureth Christ the true God with all his power, or (as they say) honoureth idols and challengeth no divine honour to himself, much less to himself only as Antichrist shall do? He humbly prayeth to God, and lowly kneeleth down in every Church at divers altars erected to God in the memories of his saints, and prayeth to them. He sayeth or heareth Mass daily with all devotion, he confesseth his sins to a priest as other men do, he adoreth the holy eucharist which Christ affirmed to be his own body; the Heretics call it an idol, (no marvel if they make the Pope his vicar Antichrist, when they make Christ himself an idol.) These religious duties doth the Pope, whereas Antichrist shall worship none, nor pray to any, at least openly."

To this comment Dr. Fulke returns the following answer. "That the great Antichrist came nine hundred years ago, you have heard by the testimony of Gregory. As for your other surmises, that he shall abolish the public exercise of all other religions true or false, saving that which must be done to himself, **HATH NO COLOUR OF REASON OUT OF THE SCRIPTURE**, although it be true that Antichrist maketh account of no religion, yet under the colour of religion and God's service, he usurpeth all honour due to God. So saith St. Jerome, that Antichrist shall obtain his Antichristian exaltation, by counterfeiting

that he is the captain or chief of the covenant, that is, of the law and testament of God.' (Dan. xi.) He shall not, therefore, abolish all religion true or false, or suffer none to be worshipped but himself; but by feigning that he is the chief of religion, and captain of God's covenant, (as the Pope doth) he should by Jerome's judgment advance himself above all religion. And, therefore, although we be not bound to such a figure of Antichrist in the blasphemous decree of Darius, yet the Pope (not for a time, but perpetually) decreeth, that none other in effect be acknowledged for God, but himself. Seeing he alone taketh upon him to dispense with the law of God, which argueth that he arrogateth to himself authority above God, the law-maker. For no law can be dispensed withal, but either by the same authority by which it was made, or by a greater. Above Christ he exalteth himself, and his propheticall, kingly and priestly office, not only in abrogating his institution of the supper in both kinds, and many other notorious matters, but also in granting full pardon of all sins, and absolving men both from the pain and the fault, which he denieth to have been done by Christ in the sacrifice of his death and passion. Yea, he deposeth Christ out of his eternal Priesthood, by setting up another sacrifice and priesthood after the order of Melchisedeck, whereby he protesteth against the sufficiency of the sacrifice and Priesthood of Christ, and also maketh every one of his vile creatures (the Mass priests) superior to Christ, God and man, whom they take upon them to offer to God his Father. *

* * * * Against the Holy Ghost he exalteth himself, blaspheming the scriptures inspired by him, to be imperfect and insufficient for the instruction of the Church without his traditions and decrees, by pronouncing that to be profane, and forbidding as unholy, which he hath sanctified, as marriage and meats, and giving special holiness to such creatures as he listeth, by usurping the office of the Holy Spirit, in applying the merits of Christ and the effect of his passion, according to his pleasure,—by his indulgencies and pardons, and by sacraments and ceremonies of

his own invention,—arrogating in all things the spirit of truth that he cannot err, exempting himself from all mortal judgments, though he carry infinite thousands with him to hell: beside innumerable other blasphemies of proud speeches, doctrines and decrees, whereof his laws and religion are full. And, therefore, although to blind the eyes of the simple he hath some hypocritical title of humility to make some shew of adoring God, in external and ceremonial manner, yet cannot he so dissemble his pride and contempt of God, but many times it breaketh forth into open blasphemy, as hath been noted in divers of them, but that which is notorious in all, and maintained by all, cannot be hidden,—how, in his greatest pomp, the sacrament, which he pretendeth to honour as God, is carried before him on a hackney, when he himself is carried on men's shoulders,—how his throne is set above the altar,—how the cross, which must be carried on the right-hand of kings' swords or sceptres, because divine honour is due to it, (as they say) is notwithstanding laid under his feet,—how in the jubilee he beateth open the gates of paradise with a golden hammer, with an hundred more notes of Antichrist, expressed in the pontificals, and practised in their solemnities."

If there be any who, admitting in general the Antichristian arrogancy and presumption of the Papacy, still entertain some doubts (unnecessary doubts, in my opinion) whether they come up to the strong language of 2 Thess. ii. 4, I would observe that there is a lower sense in which the original may be taken, and which is adopted by Cocceius in his Treatise "*de Antichristo*." He observes that the expressions *exalteth himself above all that is called God*, imply that he shall claim jurisdiction and authority over all whom Scripture and the true God denominate gods, according to Ps. lxxxii. 6, (cited by our blessed Lord, John x. 34,) *I have said, ye are gods*; and 1 Cor. viii. 5, *For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth, (as there be gods many, and lords many.)* The word *σεβασμα* he regards as signifying generally whatever is held in reverence

and awe. Hence, he says, the Roman emperors were called *σεβαστοι*. So that, according to Cocceius, the meaning is, that Antichrist shall exalt himself above all *the powers that be*, whether civil or ecclesiastical. His self-exaltation above the former is implied in his opposing and exalting *himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped*; his assumed supremacy over the latter is implied in his sitting as God *in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God*. The following remarks of Cocceius upon this subject are deserving of the reader's attention,—“Nec puto INFIRMOS magis seduci ut non credant Antichristum jam venisse, quam quia putant hunc textum dicere, quòd Antichristus Deum et Christum sit palam ac omnino abnegaturus. ‘Nam,’ ait Cornelius a Lapide, ‘Pontifex Romanus non vult coli ut Christus, nec Christum negat, imò in Christum credit, Christum colit et adorat.’ (Magna sanè postulata!) ‘Ergo non est Antichristus.’ Cæterum quum Apostolus λεγομενον Θεον η σεβασμα distinguit, supremas eminentias in Judæis et Gentibus. Suprema eminentia inter Gentes λεγεται σεβασμα. Suprema inter Judæos λεγεται Θεος, quales sacerdotes et principes populi, quibus divinum verbum in placitis consistens, commissum erat. Hi non poterant adorare, nisi Jehovah, Ps xcvii. 7. *Adorate illum omnes Dii*. Solus Jehovah est major iis, qui *nominati sunt Dii*. Ille homo peccati *effert se in omnem dictum Deum*, Jubens et decernens, omnes homines, etiam omnes Israelitas, etiam filios Aharonis, quicumque aut quorum majores Apostoli tempore vocabantur dii propter salutem et justitiam, debere suis legibus subjici et obedire. De Augustis res est palam, quòd Cæsares et reges supposuerit pedibus suis, et denique effecerit, ut potestatem suam ipsi darent.”—Johannes Cocceius, de Antichristo, p. 44.

I would add that this interpretation is sanctioned by Slade *in loco*, and that Leigh, in his “*Critica Sacra*,” observes that, “*Σεβασμα* (say some) signifieth the same with *σεβαστος* in Acts xxv. 21. 25, so that the sense is, Antichrist shall exalt himself above all kings and emperors.” This, in fact, comes ultimately

to the same point : for, if the scripture says, *that the powers that be are ordained of God*, and if the Pope says, I can enthrone or dethrone kings and emperors at my pleasure : then may it be affirmed of him in the highest sense, *that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God.*

Both these interpretations are fully sustained by the following extract from the Introduction to Dr. Isaac Barrow's celebrated Treatise on the Pope's Supremacy, in which he gives passages that he has translated from some of the standard authorities of the Church of Rome, the originals of which are inserted in the margin.

"There are among them those who ascribe to the Pope an universal, absolute and boundless empire over all persons indifferently, and in all matters ; conferred and settled on him by divine immutable sanction : so that all men, of whatever degree, are obliged in conscience to believe whatever he doth authoritatively dictate, and to obey whatever he doth prescribe. So that if princes themselves do refuse obedience to his will, he may excommunicate them, cashier them, depose them, extirpate them. If he chargeth us to hold no communion with our prince, to renounce our allegiance to him, to abandon, oppose and persecute him even to death, we may without scruple, we must in duty obey. If he doth interdict whole nations from the exercise of God's worship and service, they must comply therein. So that, according to their conceits, he is in effect Sovereign Lord of all the world ; and superior, even in temporal or civil matters, unto all kings and princes.

"It is notorious, that many canonists (if not most) and many divines of that party do maintain this doctrine ; affirming that all the power of Christ (the Lord of lords, and King of kings, to whom all power in heaven and earth doth appertain) is imparted to the Pope, as to his Vice-gerent.

"This is the doctrine which, almost 400 years ago, Augustinus Triumphus, in his egregious work concerning ecclesiastical power,

did teach; attributing to the Pope an incomprehensible and infinite power; *because great is the Lord, and great is his power, and of his greatness there is no end.*

"This is the doctrine which the leading Theologue of their sect, their angelical doctor, doth affirm, both directly, saying, that in the Pope is the top of both powers; and by plain consequence, asserting, that when any one is denounced excommunicate for apostasy, his subjects are immediately freed from his dominion, and their oath of allegiance to him.

"This the same Thomas (or an author passing under his name, in his book touching the rule of princes,) doth teach, affirming, that the Pope, as supreme king of all the world, may impose taxes on all Christians, and destroy towns and castles for the preservation of Christianity.

"THIS (AS CARD. ZABARELL, NEAR 300 YEARS AGO TELLETH US) IS THE DOCTRINE WHICH, FOR A LONG TIME, THOSE WHO WOULD PLEASE POPES DID PERSUADE THEM, THAT THEY COULD DO ALL THINGS, WHATEVER THEY PLEASED; YEA AND THINGS UNLAWFUL: AND SO COULD DO MORE THAN GOD.

"According to this doctrine then current at Rome, in the last Laterane Great Synod, under the Pope's nose and in his ear, one bishop styled him, Prince of the World; another orator called him, King of kings, and Monarch of the Earth; another great prelate said to him, that he had all power above all powers both of heaven and earth. And the same roused up Pope Leo X. in these brave terms: 'Snatch up therefore the two-edged sword of divine power committed to thee; and enjoin, command, and charge, that an universal peace and alliance be made among Christians for at least ten years; and to that bind kings in the fetters of the great King, and constrain nobles by the iron manacles of censures: for to thee is given all power in heaven and in earth.'

"This is the doctrine which Baronius with a Roman confidence doth so often assert, and drive forward, saying, 'that there can be no doubt of it, but that the civil principality is subject to the sacerdotal: and that God hath made the political government subject to the dominion of the spiritual church.'

"From that doctrine the opinion in effect doth not differ, which Bellarmine voucheth for the common opinion of Catholics, that, 'by reason of the spiritual power the Pope at least indirectly hath a supreme power even in temporal matters.'

"This opinion, so common, doth not, I say, in effect, and practical consideration, anywise differ from the former; but only in words devised to shun envy, and veil the impudence of the other assertion: for the qualifications, by reason of the spiritual power, and, at least indirectly, are but notional, insignificant and illusive in regard to practice: it importing not, if he hath in his keeping a sovereign power, upon what account, or in what formality he doth employ it; seeing that every matter is easily referable to a spiritual account; seeing that he is sole judge upon what account he doth act; seeing experience sheweth, that he will spiritualize all his interests, and upon any occasion exercise that pretended authority: seeing it little matters, if he may strike princes, whether he doth it by a downright blow, or slantingly." —A Treatise of the Pope's Supremacy. By Isaac Barrow, D.D. p. 3.

But I have not yet exhausted the coincidences between the Rhemish Annotators, and their follower, the Oxford Tract Writer. There are two coincidences of the utmost importance which yet remain to be noticed,—one relating to the individuality of Antichrist, the other to the term of his continuance. With regard to the former point, the Author of the eighty-third Tract says at p. 7, "It has been more or less implied in the foregoing remarks, that Antichrist is one man, an individual, not a power or a kingdom." Again, at p. 8, "Let it be observed, that Daniel elsewhere describes other kings, and that the event has shown them to be

individuals, as is generally confessed. * * * * * Further, that by Antichrist is meant some one person is made probable by the anticipations, which have already occurred in history, of it's fulfilment in this way." Now let us hear what this Writer's prototypes—the Rhemish Annotators—say upon this point. In their commentary upon the words, *Man of Sin*, (2 Thess. ii. 3,) they observe, amongst other things, that "The Heathen Emperors were many—Turks be many—Heretics have been and now are many, therefore they cannot be that one great Antichrist which here is spoken of, and which by the article always added in the Greek, is signified to be one special and singular man. * * * Only Heretics make no doubt but Antichrist is a whole order or succession of men, which they hold against the former evident scriptures and reason, only to establish their foolish and wicked paradox, that Christ's chief minister is Antichrist—yea the whole order." To these and other comments of the Rhemists bearing upon this subject, Dr. Fulke replies at great length, and with his usual acuteness and depth of research. But I must content myself with a few short extracts. "This great Antichrist, to discharge the Pope from being the same, you affirm to be one special and singular man, and not one state, kingdom, and succession of men therein, as the Papacy is, whereby the tyranny of Antichrist is upholden and continued, even until the coming of Christ. Let us see then upon what ground this your affirmation standeth, which being overthrown, we shall plainly prove out of the scriptures that the great Antichrist is not one singular man, but a whole state or kingdom of men, continuing under one head by succession, whereunto also we will join the testimony of the most ancient and best approved writers of the primitive Church. * * * * * Now, therefore, let us see out of the scriptures how it can be proved that Antichrist is not one singular person;—first, most evidently out of this text, where it said, that *the man of sin shall be revealed*; whereby it may be rightly gathered (as St. John also plainly saith) that Antiehrhist was even then, but

he was not revealed, or openly shewed, but closely carried about in many of his members. So St. Paul saith, (ver 7th,) the *mystery of iniquity doth even now work*, and shall not be utterly destroyed before the second coming of Christ. SEEING, THEREFORE, IT IS IMPOSSIBLE THAT ONE MAN COULD HAVE CONTINUANCE, FROM THE APOSTLE'S TIME, TO THE DAY OF JUDGMENT, IT IS MANIFEST THAT ANTICHRIST IS NO ONE SINGULAR MAN, BUT A CONTINUAL SUCCESSION OF HERETICS, FIRST SECRETLY, AND THEN OPENLY, ADVANCING THEMSELVES AGAINST CHRIST, AND GOD HIS FATHER. Hereto agree the most clear testimonies of St. John. *Who is a liar, but he that denieth that Jesus is Christ? The same is Antichrist which denieth the Father and the Son. Every one that denieth the Son hath not the Father.* 1 John ii. 22. This note, as it doth agree to all Heretics, so principally to the Pope, who decrieth the offices of Christ, as other Heretics had decried his person. * * * * Again, 1 John ii. 18, *Little children, this is the last time, and as you have heard, that ὁ ἀντίχριστος, the Antichrist cometh, even now there are many Antichrists.* Therefore, Antichrist is not one, but many, and his coming not deferred, until within the three years and a half of the end of the world, as the Papists by gross understanding of the mystical time, described in the Apocalypse, would have it: but he was come in mystery, and secretly, even in the Apostle's time; and that mystery, by the malice and subtlety of Satan, which is the spirit of Antichrist, ceased not to work, until the open and plain revelation of his pride was publicly professed in the Papacy. * * * * Chrysostom, upon this place (hom. 3) applying the text of Matt. xxiv. 24 (of many false Christs and false prophets, able to deceive the elect, if it were possible) to Antichrist, signifieth that it is not necessary to take Antichrist for one singular man. Also hom. 4, where he sheweth, that Antichrist shall come in place of the Roman empire,

—as the Roman empire came in place of the Macedonian,—the Macedonian of the Persian,—the Persian of the Median,—the Median of the Babylonian. He likewise signifieth, that Antichrist is a kingdom continued by succession, as all the rest were whom he nameth. Primasius, interpreting this text by Matt. xxiv. 24, declareth that he thought Antichrist to be no one singular person. Ruffinus, *expositione symboli*, applying also that text, Matt. xxiv. 24, declareth that he thought not Antichrist to be one singular person. Therefore, it is not the common sentence of all the ancient Fathers, that Antichrist should be one singular person.”

We now come to the question of the continuance or duration of the reign of Antichrist. Upon this point, the Author of the eighty-third Tract, at p. 4, thus expresses himself, “Further it appears that the time of Antichrist’s tyranny will be three years and a half, which is an additional reason for believing he is not come; for, if so, he must have come quite lately, his time being altogether so short; and this we cannot say he has.” Again, at pp. 45 and 46, “*They shall take away the daily sacrifice*—words which the holy Fathers interpret to mean, that Antichrist will suppress for three years and a half all religious worship.” “Well is it for Christians that the days are shortened;—shortened *for the elects’ sake*, lest they should be overwhelmed,—shortened, as it should seem, to three years and a half.”

Now let us hear the Rhemists, in their annotation on these very words, (Matt. xxiv. 22.) “The reign of Antichrist shall be short, that is, three years and a half. Dan. vii. Rev. xi. Therefore, the Heretics are blasphemous and ridiculous, that say, Christ’s Vicar is Antichrist, who hath sitten these 1500 years.” To this Dr. Fulke rejoins, “Chrysostom, hom. 77, interpreteth this place of the calamity of the Jews, which should have been all destroyed, through the great hatred and indignation of the Romans; and the text is plain, agreeing with his exposition. Yet is the time of Antichrist but short, in comparison of the eternal kingdom of

Christ, as the whole time between the ascension of Christ and his second coming, in the same respect, is called short. But that the reign of Antichrist shall be but three years and a half, is neither said by Daniel nor John. For the same time, that St. John calleth forty-two months, in the same chapter he calleth three days and a half, and afterwards 1260 days, and a time, times, and half a time, that is, half a prophetic week, for the comfort of the godly. Yet may not these days and years be counted after our usual measure of time; for that were absurd and impossible." In his reply to the same notation of time adopted by the Rhemists in their marginal note on Rev. xi. 2, he further adds, "Hentenius, a Papist, in his preface to his translation of Aretas, saith, 'it is not possible, that Antichrist in so short a time of three common years and a half, should obtain so many kingdoms and provinces.' Yet our Rhemish Papists force not of impossibility, so they might have an argument to prove that the Pope is not Antichrist."

There is one point—and I believe only one—in which I should feel myself enabled to concur with the Writer of these sermons; —and that is, the identity of Antichrist with the Man of Sin, and the Little Horn of the seventh chapter of the Prophet Daniel. The title, indeed, of the third sermon, (viz. "The City of Antichrist,") and some part of it's contents would lead the reader to suppose that the Author might possibly identify with Antichrist the Apocalyptical Woman, so graphically described in Rev. xvii. But the subject is treated with so much of the mystification which is characteristic of the school of divines to which he belongs, that it is difficult to decypher his meaning. With regard, however, to the former he is sufficiently explicit to preclude mistake. After citing the words of St. Paul, (p. 3,) *That day shall not come, except there come a falling away first*, he observes, "Here it is said that a certain frightful apostasy, and the appearing of the Man of Sin, the son of perdition, i.e. as is commonly called, Antichrist, shall precede the coming of Christ." Again, at p. 6, he says, "*That which withholdeth* still exists, though in

it's ten horns; till it is removed, Antichrist will not come. And out of them he will arise, as the same prophet (viz. Daniel) informs us: *I considered the horns, and behold, there came up among them another Little Horn, * * and behold, in this Horn were eyes like the eyes of a man, and a mouth speaking great things.*" Again, at p. 16, "It seems clear that St. Paul and St. John speak of the same enemy of the Church, from the similarity of their descriptions. They both say, that the spirit itself was already at work in their day. *That spirit of the Antichrist*, says St. John, *in the text is now already in the world. The mystery of iniquity doth already work*, says St. Paul." Once more, at p. 30,—“St. John says, *the ten horns shall hate and devour the woman*: and Daniel says, *I considered the horns, and behold, there came up among them another Little Horn with eyes like the eyes of a man, and a mouth speaking great things:—that is Antichrist.*”

It is asserted above that “*That which withholdeth* still exists, though in its ten horns; till it is removed, Antichrist will not come.” A twofold fallacy is involved in the short compass of this short sentence. In the first place, the old Roman Empire is assumed to be still in existence, under the same character, though in its divided state; and, secondly, it is manifestly implied that even in this divided state, it must pass away before Antichrist can be revealed. But this is not the only passage from which the reader may infer that in the estimation of the author, the Roman Empire has undergone no change whatever—except its division into ten kingdoms; and even upon this last point his opinions appear to be contradictory. To have admitted that these ten kingdoms had, at the instigation of the Little Horn, (Dan. vii.), for many centuries exchanged the pagan idolatry and persecuting spirit of the old Roman Empire, under its Cæsarean or Imperial head, for the Antichristian idolatry and persecuting spirit of Romanism, would have been incompatible with the views entertained by this writer and his party of the Church of

Rome, and also with the theory whereby it is maintained, that the revelation of Antichrist and the Man of Sin is yet future. It suits, therefore, the purpose of the writer to represent the Roman Empire as retaining its identity, but, like animals which lie dormant during the winter months and resuscitate in the spring, as being now in a torpid state and destined hereafter to be re-animated and to revive with increased vigour. Whether this be not a fair statement of his views, I will leave the reader to judge from the following extracts.—At p. 5, the author says, “I grant that as Rome, according to the prophet Daniel’s vision, succeeds Greece, so Antichrist succeeds Rome, and our Saviour Christ succeeds Antichrist. But it does not hence follow that Antichrist is come; for I do not grant that the Roman Empire is gone. Far from it: the Roman Empire remains even to this day.” At p. 24, he gives the following translation from a passage in the treatise of Hippolytus, whom, as we have already seen, Dr. Fulke rather unceremoniously styles “a fantastical fellow, full of fables concerning Antichrist;” “One of the Fathers, whom I have already quoted, expressly deduces from a passage in the xiiith chapter of the Apocalypse, that ‘the system of Augustus, who was founder of the Roman Empire, shall be adopted and established by him (Antichrist) in order to his own aggrandizement and glory. This is the fourth monster whose head was wounded and healed; in that the empire was destroyed and came to nought, and was divided into ten. But at this time Antichrist, as being a man of resources, will heal and restore it; so that it will be active and vigorous once more through the system which he establishes.” Again, at p. 31, the reader will meet with the following extraordinary assertions,—“It is difficult to say whether the Roman empire is gone or not: in one sense it is,—for it is divided into kingdoms; in another sense it is not,—for the date cannot be assigned at which it came to an end, and much might be said in various ways to shew that it might be considered still existing—though in a mutilated and decayed state. But if this

be so, and if it is to end in ten vigorous kings, as Daniel says, then it must one day revive. Now observe, I say, how the prophetic description answers to this account of it. *The Beast*, that is the Roman Empire, the monster that thou sawest, *was and is not, and shall ascend out of the abyss, and go into perdition*. Again, mention is made of *the Beast that was, and is not, and yet is*. Again, we are expressly told that the ten kings and the empire shall rise together; the kings appearing at the time of the monster's resurrection, not in its languid and torpid state. *The ten kings* * * * * have received no kingdom as yet, but receive power as kings one hour with the beast. If, then the Roman power is still prostrate, the ten kings have not come; and if the ten kings have not come, the destined destroyers of the Woman, the full judgments upon Rome, have not yet come."

I have already remarked that the views of this writer on the subject of the division of the Roman empire into ten kingdoms, are contradictory. Let us now see what evidence there is of the truth of this observation. At p. 5, it is asserted, that "as the ten horns belonged to the beast, and were not separate from it, so are the kingdoms into which the Roman empire has been divided part of that empire itself,"—at p. 6, that "the horns or kingdoms still exist as a matter of fact,"—at p. 23, that "the Roman empire will in its last days divide itself into ten parts." P. 30, "In the first place, the Roman Empire did break up, as foretold. It divided into a number of separate kingdoms, such as our own, France, and the like; yet it is difficult to number ten accurately and exactly." P. 31, "I say, the Roman empire has scarcely yet been divided into ten. * * * * There have, indeed, been approximations to the number, yet, I conceive, nothing more." P. 32, "If, then, the Roman empire is still prostrate, the ten kings have not come."

The patience of the reader cannot but be exhausted with the perusal of such anomalies and inconsistencies. Tedious, however, as the task has been, it was necessary to achieve it, in order that

he might be enabled to form a correct estimate of the qualifications of an Oxford Tract Writer for the office of an interpreter of prophecy. If he has gone through it, I will repay him for the exercise of his patience, by presenting him with extracts, relating to the Little Horn, *the Beast that was, and is not, and yet is, &c.*, taken from authors who did not think it necessary to reject the light of history, and to "follow the exclusive guidance of the ancient Fathers of the Church."

Sir Isaac Newton, speaking of the Apocalyptic Harlot, says—
 "She is nourished by *the merchants of the earth*, three times, or years and a half, or 42 months, or 1260 days: and in these prophecies, days are put for years. During all this time the Beast acted, and *she sat upon him*, that is, reigned over him, and over the ten kings who gave their power and strength, that is, their kingdom to the beast, and she was *drunken with the blood of the Saints*. By all these circumstances, she is the eleventh horn of Daniel's fourth Beast, who reigned with a *look more stout than his fellows*, and was of a different kind from the rest, and had eyes and a mouth like the woman; and made war with the saints, and prevailed against them, and wore them out, and thought to change times and laws, and had them given into his hand, until a time, and times, and half a time. THESE CHARACTERS OF THE WOMAN AND LITTLE HORN OF THE BEAST AGREE PERFECTLY: IN RESPECT OF HER TEMPORAL DOMINION, SHE WAS A HORN OF THE BEAST; IN RESPECT OF HER SPIRITUAL DOMINION, SHE RODE UPON HIM IN THE FORM OF A WOMAN, AND WAS HIS CHURCH, AND COMMITTED FORNICATION WITH THE TEN KINGS."—Observations upon the Apocalypse of St. John, p. 282.

Dean Woodhouse, in his commentary on these words,—*And I saw one of his heads as it were wounded to death; and the deadly wound was healed: and all the world wondered after the Beast*, Rev. xiii. 3, makes the following remarks, "During the three first centuries of the Christian times, the fourth Beast of

Daniel, the Roman monarchy, had violently persecuted the Church. He was then in full vigour and dominion. And when did he seem to cease his war against the saints? when to appear no longer beastly? when to remit his persecuting ferocity? when to receive an apparent mortal wound?—At the accession of Constantine, the first Christian emperor; whose laws, enacted for the establishment, protection, and propagation of the Christian religion, seemed at that time to have inflicted a mortal wound on the Beast. He was smitten on his Roman, or his principal head; and his death appeared certain. But the Christian leaders seizing, too eagerly, the power and riches of the world, and ensnared in the temptation, contributed most effectually to heal the deadly wound of the Beast; they restored him again to life and to power; to a power tenfold more dangerous than before, when a corrupt administration of civil tyranny began to be supported and abetted by ecclesiastical authority. Under which new form, he became an object of wonder, and of worship to the deluded inhabitants of the world.”—Annotations on the Apocalypse. By Dean Woodhouse, p. 265. In reference to the same subject it is observed in a note to p. 350, that “in history, from the date of the Apocalypse, for many centuries, there seems to be only one event,—the empire becoming Christian under Constantine,—which inflicted a mortal wound upon the secular persecuting Beast. Or to turn to the contrasted enigma of the seventeenth chapter,—WHEN CAN WE AFFIRM THAT THE BEAST WAS IN ANY SENSE, OUT OF EXISTENCE, AND YET IN EXISTENCE, UNLESS WHEN THE POWERS BY WHICH ALONE HE EXISTED, WERE ANNIHILATED BY CONSTANTINE; BUT TO THE WONDER AND ADMIRATION OF THE WORLD, RESTORED WITH TERRIBLE EFFECT UNDER THE SANCTION OF A CORRUPTED RELIGION?”

The following is the statement given at p. 366 by this able Writer upon the subject of the division of the old Roman empire

in the west into ten kingdoms,—“ History exhibits to us a time, when the Roman empire in the west, symbolized by the Beast of this chapter, (viz. the xviiith) gradually declined, and, by the irruption and repeated attacks of barbarian hordes, was broken, and fell to pieces. From the ruins of this mass ten kingdoms arose: they are thus enumerated by different writers, not only at their first establishment, but also at their progress in successive periods. Though much varied in respect to the people of which they were composed, their number has been nearly the same; so that if an average were to be taken in the long course of fourteen hundred years, reaching to our times, the number ten would be found to predominate. And when we consider the natural instability of supreme power, the wars, conquests, and the accumulation of empire to which nations are exposed,—and which have been prevalent to such excess in other quarters of the globe, during the same period,—we must think it a matter of wonder that the ten European kingdoms should subsist as they have done, in fulfilment of the prediction. But it has been fulfilled, not only in this particular, but in the character and designation of the kings. They have been at times seduced by the harlot and her intoxicating cup; they have imbibed her doctrines, and executed her bloody decrees. But a time also is promised, and has already dawned, when the kings or rulers of nations shall open their eyes to the false pretensions of their deceivers, and perform their appointed part respecting her downfall and disgrace.”

It is amongst the singular features of the eighty-third Tract, that I have been enabled to adduce answers to some of the leading propositions contained in it, gathered from the replies given by a learned Author two centuries and a half ago to Popish writers, who promulgated opinions exactly similar to those of the Author of this Tract upon these points, and derived from the same sources. I will now bring forward a recent instance by citing a note of Mr. Faber's, in reply to Dr. Walmesley, whose disquisitions on the Apocalypse excited a great sensation in Ire-

land some years ago. This learned and acute Writer observes, that "The modern Popish expositor, Bishop Walmesley, (who, under the assumed name of Signor Pastorini, published a general history of the Christian Church deduced from the Apocalypse,) quitting the ground occupied by his more cautious predecessors, allows, that the ten horns of the Roman beast can only be the ten Gothic kingdoms, which sprang up in the fifth and sixth centuries when the Western empire was partitioned : yet, with singular inconsistency though for very obvious reasons, he stiffly contends, that the rise of the little horn is still future. Nothing, however, can be more evident, as the early Fathers of the Church clearly saw and maintained, than that both the little horn springs up synchronically with the ten horns, and that all these eleven horns arise geographically in one and the same region. In truth, unless this be admitted, the prophecy can never be accomplished. The little horn is to eradicate three out of the ten primary horns. But, of the ten primary horns, (such have been the political revolutions of the west,) only two are now in existence ; the kingdom of the Franks, and the kingdom of the Anglo-Saxons : or, if we assent to the assertion of Mr. Gibbon, we shall even say, that the single kingdom of the Franks alone can boast an unbroken descent from the conquerors of the Roman empire. It is, therefore, physically impossible, that any imagined yet future little horn can accomplish the terms of the prophecy : for, if at the most only two of the ten primary horns are now in existence, it is quite clear that no future little horn can eradicate or subdue three of them. Hence, if the ten larger horns be the ten Gothic kingdoms ; of which circumstance, Bishop Walmesley himself being judge, there can be no reasonable doubt : it will inevitably follow from such premises, both that the little horn was springing up synchronically with the ten primary large horns in the course of the fifth and sixth centuries, and that the geographical stage of its growth was the Western Roman empire. In short, if the rise of the little horn be still future ; the rise of the ten horns,

notwithstanding the Western empire has already been partitioned by ten Gothic nations, must be future also: and, conversely, if the rise of the ten horns be long since past; the rise of the little horn must also be long since past.

"This principle is so evident, that Jerome, who places the destruction of the Roman empire and its partition by ten kings at the end of the world, consistently ascribes to the same period the rise and exploits of the eleventh little horn.

"Ergo dicamus, quod omnes scriptores ecclesiastici tradiderunt: in consummatione mundi, quando regnum destruendum est Romanum, decem futuros reges qui orbem Romanum inter se dividant, et undecimum surrecturum esse regem parvulum, qui tres reges de decem regibus superaturus sit. Quibus interfectis, etiam septem alii reges victori colla submittent. Hieron. Comment. in loc. See also Iren. adv. Hær. lib. v. c. 21. .

"That the division of the Roman empire by ten nations into ten primary kingdoms has long since occurred, not (as Jerome gratuitously imagined) at the end of the world, is now a matter of history. Such being the case, on that Father's very just principle of exposition, the rise of the little horn (let it symbolize what power it may,) its subversion of three out of the ten primary kingdoms, and the submission of all the remaining kingdoms to its extraordinary domination, must also have long since occurred.

"On the whole, I see not how we can consistently deny the long since accomplished rise and the long since established domination of the little horn, unless we be also prepared to deny the destruction and partition of the Western empire, in the fifth and sixth centuries, by the ten victorious Gothic nations. We may explain the symbol of the little horn as we please: but, if the Western empire has been partitioned, the power represented by the little horn must have long since made its appearance."—The Sacred Calendar of Prophecy. By the Rev. G. S. Faber, vol. ii. p. 76, note.

If some secret misgivings should be awakened in the mind of a

conscientious Romanist by the perusal of any interpretation of the prophecies relating to the Church of Rome which identified her with the Little Horn of the prophet Daniel, the Man of Sin of St. Paul, the Mother of Harlots of St. John, &c. ; it must be a great relief to his mind to be assured by the writer of this Tract that she is in no way concerned with these prophetic symbols, but that they have a reference to a potent adversary of the truth, an individual Antichrist who is at some future time to make a conspicuous figure on the earth. It must be an additional consolation to him, if he can be brought to persuade himself that the judgments denounced against the city upon seven hills may peradventure never be fulfilled, or that Rome itself may be a type of some other city, or of the world at large. This Oxford Tract Writer generously affords him this consolation. After having remarked, that "surely Rome is spoken of in scripture as a more inveterate enemy of God and his saints even than Babylon, as the great pollution and bane of the earth : if then Babylon has been destroyed wholly, much more, according to all reasonable conjecture, will Rome be destroyed one day ;" he afterwards observes : "This is what may be said on the one side, but after all, something may be said on the other : not indeed to shew that the prophecy is already fully accomplished, for it certainly is not, but to shew that granting this, what accomplishment remains has reference not to Rome, but to some other object or objects of divine vengeance. I shall explain my meaning under two heads. —First, why has not Rome been destroyed hitherto ? how was it that the barbarians left it ? Babylon sunk under the avenger whom God brought against it—Rome has not : why is this ? for if there has been a something to procrastinate the vengeance due to Rome hitherto, peradventure that obstacle may act again and again, and stay the uplifted hand of divine wrath, till the end come. * * * * * If it were what some would make it, if it were as reprobate as heathen Rome itself, what stays the judgment long ago begun ? why does not the avenging arm

which made its first stroke ages since, deal its second and its third, till the city has fallen? why is not Rome as Sodom and Gomorrah, if there be no righteous men in it?—This then is the first remark I would make as to the fulfilment of the prophecy which is yet to come; perchance, through God's mercy, it may be procrastinated even to the end and never be fulfilled. Of this we can know nothing one way or the other.

"2. Secondly, let it be considered, that as Babylon is a type of Rome and of the world of sin and vanity, so Rome in turn may be a type also, whether of some other city, or of a proud and deceiving world. * * * * Various great cities in scripture are made, in their ungodliness, in ruin, types of the world itself. * * * * As then their ruin prefigures a greater and wider judgment, so the chapters, of which the text (Rev. xvii. 18,) forms a part, may have a further accomplishment not in Rome, but in the world itself, or some other great city to which we cannot at present apply them."—Advent Sermons on Antichrist, pp. 35. 38.

But the Romanist is not yet aware of the extent of his obligations to the Author of this Tract.—Certain persons, whom the Oxford Tract Writers would stigmatize as Ultra-Protestants, in the vehemence of their zeal against Popery, have been accustomed to regard the Church of Rome as an apostate Church, and to allege, amongst the multiplied proofs of its apostacy, the fact, which they deemed to be one of notoriety, that its members had, during the lapse of many centuries, been guilty of the most unrelenting persecution of the members of the true Church of Christ. Nay, one of them (Bishop Newton, *Dissertations on the Prophecies*, vol. iii. p. 296,) has gone so far as to make the following assertions. "It is very true, as was hinted before, that if Rome Pagan hath slain her thousands of innocent Christians, Rome Christian hath slain her ten thousands. For, not to mention other outrages, slaughters, and barbarities, the crusades against the Waldenses and Albigenes, the murders committed

by the Duke of Alva in the Netherlands, the massacres in France, and in Ireland, will probably amount to above ten times the number of all the Christians slain in all the ten persecutions of the Roman Emperors put together." But this writer has made the novel discovery that the Church has endured no persecution, since the persecutions ceased, which were inflicted upon her by the heathen Emperors. It is his theory, as we have already seen, that Antichrist has not yet made his appearance in the world. If this be so, of course the persecutions of which, according to the tenor of prophecy, he was to be the author, have not yet taken place. In pursuance of this theory, the author of the Tract says, at p. 45, "Let us then apprehend and realize the idea thus clearly brought before us, that SHELTERED AS THE CHURCH HAS BEEN FROM PERSECUTION FOR 1500 YEARS, yet a persecution awaits it, before the end, fierce and more perilous than any which occurred at its first rise." Believing as I do that the faithful witnesses to *the truth as it is in Jesus*, have prophesied *in sackcloth* during the greater part of that period, I should infer that Antichrist had already come, and that he was to be found in that apostate Church which had occasioned the persecution of the witnesses. Indeed, it would puzzle any one to reconcile the supposed exemption of the Church from persecution during so long a period as 1500 years, with an assertion made by the same writer at p. 41. Speaking of persecutions, he says, "They are not indeed the *necessary* lot of the Church, but at least one of her appropriate badges; so that on the whole, looking at the course of history, you might set down persecution as one of the peculiarities by which you recognize her." The truth of this observation I will admit in the most unqualified manner. But, if it be true, it is decisive against the pretensions of the Church of Rome, and equally decisive in favour of those holy and devoted men *who resisted unto blood* in promoting the great work of the Reformation, and to the myriads before them who, during successive centuries, fell victims to the

remorseless cruelty of the *Woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus.*

Upon the whole,—the impression left upon my mind by a careful examination of the subject is, that the most zealous votary of the Church of Rome could not, as far as the question of prophecy is concerned, have subserved her interests more effectually than by the scheme of interpretation which has been adopted by the author of this Tract. At the same time, justice to him requires that I should notice any expressions which occur of an adverse nature. All that I can find of this description are introduced at p. 37, where the following statement is made,—“That part of the Christian Church (alas!) has in process of time become infected with the sins of Rome itself, and learned to be ambitious and cruel after the fashion of those who possessed the place aforesaid.”—To these words is subjoined the following note,—“No opinion, one way or the other, is here expressed as to the question, how far AS THE LOCAL CHURCH HAS SAVED ROME, so Rome has corrupted the local Church, or whether the local Church in consequence, or, again, whether other Churches elsewhere, may or may not be types of Antichrist.” Of these admissions, such as they are, I can only say,—*valeant, quantum valeant!*

It is the well known boast of the Romanist that his Church is unchanged and unchangeable, That her persecuting spirit has undergone no alteration where the opportunity for its display is presented, has been evinced by the treatment which Protestants in Ireland have experienced at the hands of Romanists during the last ten years. It is further demonstrated by the fact, as stated in the Quarterly Review, (June. 1839, No. cxxvii. p. 121,) “that more than four hundred harmless inhabitants of the Tyrol have been forcibly expelled from their homes and their possessions, —simply because they refused to remain in the Communion of

Rome."—With reference to this fact, the Reviewer makes the following observations. "THE INTRIGUES, EFFORTS, AND OPEN OPERATIONS OF POPERY SHOW THAT IT IS STILL THE SAME SUBTLE, FAITHLESS, PERSECUTING, AND RELENTLESS ENEMY WITH WHICH OUR FATHERS HAD TO CONTEND. It is needless now to make any allusion to the atrocities of the 16th century, or to the narrative of Huguenot suffering in the 17th, or to the sad story of the Saltsburgh exiles in the 18th. The accounts before us, of the expulsion of the Zillerdale Protestants from Austria, present to us the Popery of the 19th century, and afford a very clear idea of the nature of the system, and of the effect which it produces upon crowned heads, and statesmen subject to its influence."

But before I conclude this long article, I must present to the reader an evidence both of that unchangeableness of the Church of Rome, which is a necessary result of her arrogant assumption of infallibility, and of the truth of the charges alleged against her by Mede in his admirable treatise on "the Apostasy of the Latter Times," the extent and validity of which could scarcely have been anticipated in the present day. This evidence is contained in a work entitled, "Lives of St. Alphonsus Liguori, St. Francis de Girolamo, St. John Joseph of the Cross, St. Pacificus of San Severino, and St. Veronica Giuliani: whose canonization took place on Trinity Sunday, May 26th 1839."—This work was published by Dolman, No. 61, New Bond Street, the great Popish bookseller and publisher; and it is especially deserving of notice, that it was advertized on the cover of "the Catholic Magazine," in 1 vol. 12mo., "UNIFORM WITH DR. WISEMAN'S LECTURES ON THE DOCTRINES AND PRACTICES OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH."

But before I make my intended quotations from this extraordinary work, I will insert at length the account which was given in "the Catholic Magazine" for July, 1839, (No. XXX.

p. 504,) of the gorgeous and imposing ceremony of canonization. It is a curious document, as affording a remarkable illustration of Rev xvii. 4, *And the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication.*

“Rome.—The Canonization.—The following particulars of this splendid ceremony have been communicated, in a private letter from Rome, to the Dublin Weekly Register, dated on the night of Trinity Sunday :—“Sir, I hasten to send you a few details of the recent canonization in the capital of the Christian world, which may interest many of your Irish Catholic readers. It is agreed on all hands, that the ceremonial was the most magnificent that has been witnessed in Rome for a great number of years; and when I speak of Rome I may include the universe, as in no part of the world are such facilities afforded for conducting a religious fête as in the metropolis of Catholicity. The ceremony took place on Trinity Sunday, when the following were solemnly enrolled in the catalogue of the saints :—Alphonse Maria de Liguori, Francis Hieronymo, John Joseph of the Cross, Pacificus of San Severino, and Veronica of Juliani. The first on the list is dead about fifty-two years, and is well known by his theology and pious writings throughout the Christian world. He had been a lawyer, but renounced that profession from religious motives, and embraced the ecclesiastical state. His whole life was spent in the exercise of charity and good works. He was promoted to a See in the kingdom of Naples, and founded a celebrated and useful congregation, which has already been productive of great benefit in several parts of Italy. The other venerable persons, though eminent for great sanctity and miracles, are less known to the world; but no doubt the lives of all will be speedily published. A most rigorous inquiry has been going on for a great number of years into their lives, writings, doctrines, and miracles. What a grand lesson is read to the whole Christian world in this

interesting spectacle! Though these holy servants of God, and humble disciples of the cross, lived in comparative obscurity, their names and virtues are now published to the world. The venerable head of the Church, under Christ, invites all his children to honour their memories, and spares no expense in the celebration of a solemn rite, by which they are for ever enregistered in the catalogue of the blessed. That saying of the inspired psalmist, 'The desire of sinners shall perish, but the just man shall be in eternal glory,' is faithfully realised by the Church of Rome, in the honours which she renders to her children who have departed this life in the odour of sanctity, and whose holiness is attested by undeniable proofs.

"On the eve of Trinity Sunday, from the hour of the *Angelus*, the cannon of the castle of St. Angelo and all the bells of the city, announced the happy news to the citizens of Rome. At midnight, various bands of music played through the principal streets. At four o'clock in the morning the castle of St. Angelo commenced a salute of 101 guns, and at that early hour the streets were crowded with persons from all parts of the world, who bent their steps to that most unparalleled of all human temples, the basilica of St. Peter. The soldiers of His Holiness, the civic guards, and other public bodies, kept the streets from an early hour, and preserved the greatest order. At six o'clock, to the minute, the procession moved from the gate of the Vatican palace. It was headed by the children of all the orphan schools in that city of true charity, after whom were the children of the respectable schools and those of the nobility. Next came all the mendicant orders, each headed by its standard; then the cross bearers, the Servites, the Dominicans, the Jesuits, &c., and all the parish priests in white stoles; the chapters of the various Churches, preceded by crosses and banners, the generals of orders, the mitred abbots, the prelates, bishops, archbishops, and patriarchs, all in white linen mitres; the penitentiaries of all languages in white chasubles; the officers of the Pope's house-

hold in the richest dresses. Afterwards, the various banners of the new saints were borne by members of the orders to which they respectively belonged. Such of the family or relatives of the canonized as were in Rome, walked beneath those banners. That of St. Alphonse Liguori, in particular, was surrounded by young Neapolitan officers, amongst whom was a lieutenant general. They were all nephews or grand-nephews of the saint. A venerable old man, who had been baptized by the holy bishop, also walked after his banner. Last of all came the cardinals, each with the insignia and ornaments of his dignity. All wore mitres of white watered silk.

"The moment his holiness issued from the palace, arrayed in all his pontifical ornaments, and borne on a throne with the tiara on his head, all the bells commenced ringing, the drums beat, and the numerous bands began to play. He was surrounded by the officers of his household and the senators of Rome, in full costume, with cloth of gold mantles. The venerable Pontiff bestowed his blessings on the immense crowds, who bent as he passed along. In his left hand he carried a wax light, as did every other member of the procession. After it had advanced in the greatest order for an hour and a half, it reached St. Peter's. The clergy entered the church. The Pope, attended by the cardinals, went to pray in the chapel of the Holy Sacrament, and afterwards took his seat on the throne that was prepared for him. At this time every part of the vast edifice was filled, but there was not the slightest disorder. Several galleries and seats were raised round the grand altar, and were filled with ladies and the most respectable of all the foreign visitants. It was an imposing sight, and it appears that the English, who make themselves so offensive in Catholic countries, and especially at Rome, by their scandalous indecorum in the churches, were better behaved than usual. Indeed, it was impossible for any one, having the least mark of religious feeling, not to be moved by the magnificent scene. The King of Naples, the King of Bavaria, Don Miguel,

the Queen Dowager of Sardinia, and the foreign ambassadors, had special seats in velvet drapery reserved for them. The cardinals, bishops, abbots, and generals of orders, filled the space between the grand altar and the pontifical throne. The ceremony commenced with some music, finely executed by the Pope's choir, who were stationed in a gallery at the right of the principal altar. At nine o'clock the Pope, after the usual formalities, pronounced the sentence of canonization. It was an overpowering moment. The *Te Deum* was intoned, all the bells of the church were rung, the bands, the trumpets, the drums, and all the belfries of Rome responded to the joyous chaunt. Many were affected even to tears during these awful and enthusiastic moments. Soon after, the pontifical was commenced. At its termination St. Peter's was rapidly emptied. His Holiness went to give his papal benediction, *urbi et orbi*, from a gallery over the great door of St. Peter's. The immense space in front was filled by a multitude of every tribe, and tongue, and people; and when Gregory XVI. appeared on his throne, surrounded by the sacred college, the mighty ocean of human beings was lulled into profound stillness. The sonorous voice of the aged Pontiff was distinctly heard, as he prayed a heavenly benediction on the heads of his people; and when he raised his anointed hands to bless them, every knee, as if involuntarily, bent. The cannon, music, and bells were again heard, and this most imposing of all ceremonies was closed. It rained in the evening, and the illumination of the dome of St. Peter's was necessarily postponed. It was hoped, however, that it would take place on the following night. This grand spectacle would complete the august ceremony. It would be impossible to give an idea of the decorations of St. Peter's on this occasion. No expense was spared. One vast picture, representing the five saints received by angels into paradise, covered the pediment of St. Peter's. Beneath this, and in various parts of the vestibule, as well as throughout the interior, were several appropriate Latin inscriptions. The whole of the interior was draped with silk

and gold. The light of day was excluded, but the whole church was splendidly illuminated with wax. Forty lustres, filled with wax lights, and flowers most tastefully arranged, hung from the ceiling. One hundred and ten round gilt lamps, filled with lights, were suspended at equal distances from the marble cornice that supports the ceiling. Thirty candelabra were lighted before the figures of the saints, and a hundred beautiful girandoles were placed against the pilasters in the grand nave and the transepts. It is calculated there were from ten to fifteen thousand wax lights used at the ceremony."

I now come to the work itself. Prefixed to it is an advertisement to the following effect,—“It has been deemed advisable to present to the public an account of the lives and virtues of the five saints, whose canonization took place on Trinity Sunday, 26th May, 1839. This account has been extracted from the following works, published by the postulators to whom the cause of their beatification or canonization was entrusted, and who have been in possession of the original documents used on these occasions.”—A list of the publications is then subjoined.

This advertisement is followed by an introduction, extending to nearly twenty pages, which contains a very clear account of all the preliminary steps that must be taken before the decree of canonization is issued, and of the ceremonies which are observed upon the occasion. The object of it is thus stated, and reference is given to an authentic source of information.—“We propose to give in these few pages an abstract of the processes observed by the Church at various times in canonizing saints, and afterwards to describe the ceremonies observed at the present day in canonizations. In this account we shall closely follow that given by Benedict XIV. in his great work, *De Servorum Dei Beatificatione et Beatorum Canonizatione*, to which the reader is referred for fuller information upon each point, as well as for the proofs of what we advance.”—It is probable that few Protestants are aware of the distinction implied in the work above mentioned. It is

thus explained in a note to page vii.—“The chief differences between beatification and canonization are, that the former is generally confined to a particular diocese, religious order, or province, &c. ; while the latter extends to the whole world : the former is permitted (not simply tolerated), the latter is enjoined to the faithful.”

As the introduction itself professes to be only an abstract, it would be difficult to compress it into a smaller compass. I must, therefore, present to the reader the whole account of the processes which are adopted anterior to beatification and canonization respectively. To me the document appears to be of supreme importance, because when compared with the supposititious and counterfeit miracles subsequently recorded, it affords the most complete confirmation of the train of argument pursued by Mede in his excellent treatise on “the Apostasy of the Latter Times,” and demonstrates, beyond the possibility of cavil or dispute, that, as the dæmonolatry or saint-worship of the Church of Rome was originally introduced and established by the *hypocrisy of liars*, so it is still perpetuated and upheld by the same fraudulent means. —“THE HOLY SEE HAS EVER BEEN MOST RIGID IN THE INVESTIGATION OF THE CAUSES SUBMITTED TO IT.” Passing over the proofs that might be collected from earlier times, we confine ourselves to the practice at present observed, according to the rules laid down for the guidance of the Congregation of Rites by Urban III. in 1625, 1634, 1642 ; and by succeeding Popes since his time.

“Causes of beatification or canonization regard either martyrs or confessors ; some of these were introduced before the publication of the decrees of Urban VIII, others since that time ; some again are introduced in the ordinary way, styled *via non cultus* ; others form extraordinary exceptions, and are said to be introduced *per viam extraordinariam casus excepti*. Of the two last only it is necessary to speak.

“The holy See never receives or entertains any cause, unless

it can first be proved that the subject of it enjoys a reputation for sanctity and miracles, and that no public veneration (*cultus publicus*) has been paid to him. On this account the whole cause is said to be introduced *per viam non cultus*. The ordinary of the diocese from which the cause is brought to Rome, draws up, in virtue of his own authority, two processes, in which he pronounces that the deceased servant of God enjoys this reputation, and that the decrees of Urban VII, forbidding public honours to be given without leave from the holy See, have been complied with.

“As soon as these processes reach Rome, the postulators of the cause, (who are appointed by the parties who are anxious to obtain the beatification or canonization,) humbly petition the Congregation of Rites to allow them to be opened. The promoter of the faith is summoned, and in the presence of the cardinal-prefect of the Congregation, the processes are opened, and witnesses are called to prove the genuineness of the seals and signatures attached to them.

“The next step is to obtain from the Pope the appointment of one of the cardinals of the Congregation, to fill the place of reporter or *ponent*. If the servant of God has left any writings, they are carefully revised and examined, and if the Congregation pronounces that they contain nothing to arrest the progress of the inquiry, the *signing of the commission* for taking up the cause by the Pope's authority may take place, provided that ten years have elapsed since the delivery of the ordinary processes to the Congregation.

“The Congregation next addresses remissorial letters to three bishops (the presence of two of whom during the drawing up of the process is always requisite), whose dioceses are in the neighbourhood of the place where the processes are to be compiled, instructing them to draw up a process, by apostolic authority from the Pope, containing proofs that the deceased possesses a reputation for sanctity and miracles *in general*. If this process

be approved by the Congregation, other remissorials are sent, ordering the delegates to receive evidence on each virtue and miracle in particular, and to forward them to Rome. This last process is opened with the same solemnity as before, and its validity being proved, the Congregation proceeds to examine the virtues and miracles in detail, provided that fifty years have elapsed since the death of the servant of God. This examination is made in three different meetings; the first, called *ante-preparatory*, takes place in the palace of the cardinal-reporter, and is attended by the consultors or confidential advisers of the Congregation, who are very numerous, and by the masters of ceremonies. The former alone give their votes, and the object of this meeting seems to be for the purpose of instructing the cardinal-reporter in the merits and difficulties of the case, before he reports upon it to the whole Congregation. The second examination, called *preparatory*, takes place in the Pope's palace, before the entire body of cardinals composing the Congregation, the consultors, and masters of ceremonies; and on this occasion, when the meeting is for the purpose of instructing the cardinals, the consultors alone vote. The *general* congregation is then held in the presence of the Pope; but both the cardinals and consultors give their votes. The examination is proposed in the form of a doubt, whether the servant of God possessed the theological and cardinal virtues in a heroic degree; and until this doubt has been favourably resolved, the question respecting the miracles said to have been wrought through his intercession, cannot be entertained. After receiving the votes of the cardinals and consultors, the Pope defers pronouncing his decision, and requests them in the mean time to join with him in prayer to implore the light of God upon his deliberations; and some time afterwards, having formed his determination, he summons the cardinal-reporter, the secretary promoter of the faith, and orders the decree to be published, containing his approval of the virtues of the deceased, in this

form,—*Constat de virtutibus theologicis et cardinalibus earumque annexis in gradu heroico in casu et ad effectum de quo agitur.* Thus, Benedict XIV closed his glorious career on earth, by ordering the decree approving the virtues of St. Francis de Girolamo upon his death-bed, after he had received the holy sacrament of extreme unction. The miracles reported to have been performed through the intercession of the servant of God, are next examined in three Congregations, as before; and after again delaying until he has implored the assistance and light of God, the Pope issues a second decree, approving one or more of the miracles proposed to the general congregation. The farther question is also proposed, in another general congregation, whether, seeing that the miracles and virtues of the servant of God have been approved, it be safe to proceed to his beatification? It is required that in every case two-thirds of the suffrages be in favour of the cause, otherwise it cannot be proceeded with. At every stage the promoter of the faith must be consulted, and it is his duty to bring forward every objection that he thinks fit *against* the proofs of the virtues and miracles of the servant of God; and for this purpose he must be furnished with all the depositions and informations taken in the cause. His arguments are stated in writing, and the advocates employed in the cause prepare their reply. The relations of the miracles are submitted to physicians and surgeons, who deliver in writing their opinion, whether the facts related could have been produced by natural means.

“When all these doubts have been satisfactorily removed, the Pope appoints a day for the solemn beatification of the servant of God, who then receives the title of *Beatus* (*bienheureux*, or *blessed*.)

“By the ‘extraordinary way of exception,’ as it is called, Urban VIII. allowed the causes of saints to be introduced, who had already received public veneration, provided that they had been publicly honoured from time immemorial, by apostolic indult, or in the writings of the fathers and saints of the Church. In

these cases the ordinary pronounces that the deceased enjoys a reputation for sanctity and miracles, and that the veneration paid to him has subsisted from time immemorial. If this veneration is approved by the congregation, the servant of God is deemed *equivalently beatified*.

“As soon as there is reason to believe that additional miracles have been wrought since the beatification of the servant of God, the postulators humbly petition the congregation of rites to obtain the signing of the commission for resuming the cause, and the expediting of fresh remissorials to the same or other delegates, instructing them to receive evidence of the miracles reported to have taken place. This process, when sent to Rome, is examined with the same rigour and exactness, in three congregations, as before; and if the decision is favourable, the final question is proposed,—whether, after the approval of the miracles, it be safe to proceed to the canonization? Two miracles are required before beatification, and two more, which have taken place since that time, before beatification. After these three congregations have pronounced their opinion, the decree is issued, to the effect that the canonization may safely take place. Fresh prayers are addressed to the Pope from different nations and sovereigns, to induce him to perform the solemn rite of canonization. As soon as the time has been determined, the Pope summons a secret consistory of the cardinals, to whom a summary of the virtues and miracles of the saint has previously been submitted. A summary is also read in the consistory, and each cardinal answers *placet*, or *non placet*, when his vote is asked. A public consistory is afterwards held, and public prayers ordered: and finally, a *semi-public* consistory, at which all the cardinals, patriarchs, and bishops, in Rome, attend, and each gives his vote upon the cause. The day for the solemn canonization is announced, when the ceremony is performed, which we shall now proceed to describe.”

It would be superfluous to insert the whole of this description,

as it has been fully exemplified in the narrative taken from the Catholic Magazine, which has already been submitted to the reader's attention. But the concluding part of the ceremony, which the narrator has prudently omitted, is too remarkable to be withheld.

"The first who invokes the newly canonized by the title of saint is the cardinal-deacon, assisting at the right hand of the pontiff. For, at the conclusion of the *Te Deum*, he chaunts "*Orate pro nobis S.S. N.N.*" The choir responds, and the Pope sings the prayer. The cardinal-deacon, who has to sing the gospel at mass, going to the left hand of the pontiff, recites the *Confiteor*, adding, after the invocation of the holy apostles, the names of the new saints. When this is concluded, the auditor of the Rota, who officiates as sub-deacon, comes before the throne with the cross, and the Pope gives his benediction, adding, in the prayer *Precibus et meritis Beatæ Mariæ semper Virginis, &c.*, after the names of S.S. Peter and Paul, those of the saints newly canonized. Here, strictly speaking, concludes the ceremony. The high mass, which follows, is not an essential part thereof, nor is it necessarily sung by the pontiff. The only points in which it differs from the usual papal high mass are, that the collect of the new saints is joined to that of the day; and the Pope, after the gospel has been sung in Greek and Latin, delivers a homily, and gives a plenary indulgence to all present at the function, and another of seven years and seven *quadragesæ* (forty days) to such as may visit the shrines of the saints on their annual feast. The last peculiar circumstance consists in the oblation made at the offertory, or immediately after the canonization, if the Pope should not celebrate high mass. These consist of wax-candles, loaves, and small barrels of wine, of turtle-doves, pigeons, and other kinds of birds. They are presented, on behalf of the postulators, by the cardinal-procurator and the cardinal of the congregation of rites, three in each cause; to wit, a cardinal bishop, a cardinal-priest, and a cardinal-deacon of the said con-

gregation ; and in default of so many cardinal-bishops as there are saints, by cardinal-priests in their stead ; or if the congregation cannot supply the requisite number, it is made up from the senior cardinals of the sacred college. The offerings, which are presented with great solemnity and ceremony, are, as follow, for each saint : Two large wax candles of forty-five pounds weight each, beautifully decorated with effigies of the saint, are carried by two attendants of the cardinal-bishop, who follows them. A smaller taper, and a cage, containing two pigeons, are borne by the postulator of the cause, and another member of the order to which the saint belonged, or of the community which has moved the cause. Two loaves, one gilded, the other silvered, with the armorial bearings of the pontiff represented upon them, are carried upon two dishes, of wood, silvered. The cardinal-priest follows, and two other religious, or seculars, according to the order to which the saint belonged, carrying a small taper, and a cage containing two turtle-doves. The cardinal-deacon succeeds,—two barrels of wine, one gilded, the other silvered, being carried before him ; and, lastly, two other religious, or seculars, with a taper, and a cage, containing divers kinds of birds. The cardinal-bishop presents the large tapers ; the cardinal-procurator the smaller ones ; the cardinal-priest, the bread ; the cardinal-deacon, the wine ; and, finally, the cardinal-procurator, the different kinds of birds, each kissing the hand of the Pope. The same order and ceremony are observed in presenting the offerings of the other saints ; and, when all are finished, the Pope goes on with the mass. At its conclusion, the pontiff sits in his chair of state, with his tiara on his head, and receives from the cardinal-archdeacon of the Basilica, a purse, embroidered with gold, containing twenty-five crowns, such being the custom whenever the Pope sings mass."

In the assemblage of monstrous and extravagant fictions which are recorded in the lives of these saints, as I cannot insert them all, the chief difficulty lies in the selection. The reader who

wishes to ascertain for himself what Popery is in the 19th century will consult the original work. He will there find remarkable illustrations of the three following texts, viz.: 2 Thess. ii. 9; Rev. xiii. 14; Rev. xix. 20. In the first, St. Paul, speaking of the *Man of Sin*, describes him as *that Wicked, whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders*. In the second, St. John, in his vision of the *Bestia Ecclesiastica*, which *had two horns like a lamb, and spake as a dragon*, says that he *deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by the means of those miracles which he had power to do in sight of the beast*; and in the last, he says that, *the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him, with which he deceived them that had received the mark of the beast, and them that worshipped his image*.

In the life of Alphonsus Liguori it is stated that immediately after he was ordained he became a most zealous and indefatigable preacher. "But his unceasing labours soon brought on a dangerous illness, in which his life was saved, when he was at the very point of death, by the intercession of the blessed Virgin of mercy, a statue of whom was brought to his bedside."—P. 9. At page 12 it is said, that "his loving patroness, our blessed Lady, rewarded his zeal in the cause of charity and devotion by appearing to him in the sight of an immense crowd of people, collected in the Church of Foggia, to listen to a discourse upon HIS FAVOURITE SUBJECT, THE INTERCESSION AND PATRONAGE OF MARY. From her countenance a ray of light like that of the sun was reflected upon the face of her devout servant, which was seen by all the people, who cried out, *a miracle! a miracle!* and recommended themselves with great fervour and many tears to the Mother of God. * * * * * Alphonsus, in his juridical attestation, deposed, that during the sermon, he, together with the assembled audience, saw the countenance of the blessed Virgin, resembling that of a girl of fourteen

or fifteen years of age, who turned from side to side, as was witnessed by every one present."

We are subsequently informed that, "God rewarded his zeal by several prodigies; for one day, during a mission at Amalfi, a person going to confession at the house where Alphonsus lived, found him there at the very time for beginning the sermon in the Church. After he had finished his confession, he went straight to the Church, and to his surprise found Alphonsus some way advanced in his sermon. He was astonished at this circumstance, for, at his departure, he had left Alphonsus hearing the confession of other persons at his house, and had not seen him come out of the only door through which he could possibly pass on his way to the Church. It was therefore reported in the city that Alphonsus heard confessions at home at the same time that he was preaching in the Church. Whilst he was preaching on the patronage of the blessed Virgin, and exciting his hearers to recur with confidence to her, in all their wants, he suddenly exclaimed,—'O, you are too cold in praying to our blessed Lady! I will pray to her for you.' He knelt down in the attitude of prayer, with his eyes raised to heaven, **AND WAS SEEN BY ALL PRESENT LIFTED MORE THAN A FOOT FROM THE GROUND**, and turned towards a statue of the blessed Virgin, near the pulpit. The countenance of our Lady darted forth beams of light, which shone upon the face of the ecstatic Alphonsus. This spectacle lasted five or six minutes, during which the people cried out, '*Mercy, Mercy! a Miracle, a Miracle!*' But the saint rising up, exclaimed in a loud voice, 'Be glad, for the blessed Virgin has granted your prayer.' Before the missionaries left the city, Alphonsus foretold that an earthquake would take place on the following day, and the event proved the truth of his words. * * * * * We have already spoken of his tender affection towards our blessed Lady. One day his director happening to express his confidence that she would ap-

pear to him, at least at the hour of his death, as she had often appeared to many of her servants ;—‘Mark,’ said Alphonsus, ‘when I was young, I often conversed with our Lady, and she directed me in all the affairs of the order.’ His director repeatedly asked him what she had said to him ; but his only answer was, ‘She said so many sweet things, she said so many sweet things.’ He declared the blessed Virgin the protectress of his order, and sought to encourage devotion to her, as a powerful means of obtaining divine grace. ‘THE REFORMERS,’ said he, ‘REPRESENT THE DEVOTION TO MARY AS INJURIOUS TO GOD, DENYING HER POWER, AND IMPUGNING HER POTENT INTERCESSION ; BUT IT IS OUR DUTY TO SHEW, FOR THE PROFIT OF OUR HEARERS, HOW POWERFUL SHE IS WITH GOD, AND HOW PLEASING IT IS TO HIM TO SEE HER HONOURED.’ These feelings of devotion to her he has embodied in his ‘*Glories of Mary*,’ which has made known in England and other countries, the filial tenderness and love which he cherished towards our holy Mother.”—P. 26, 46.

The veneration which this devout worshipper of the Virgin Mary entertained for the Pope may be instanced by the account of some of his numerous publications which is given at page 47. It is there stated, that “as a proof of his profound veneration for the Pope, the visible head of the Church, the representative of Christ on earth, we need only mention his ‘*Vindiciæ pro supremâ Pontificis potestate adversus Justinum Febronium*,’ composed to refute the Jansenistical opinions advanced by that Author. With the same view, he wrote three other treatises in Latin, the first proving and defending the infallibility of the Pope in his decisions upon faith and morals ; the second, establishing his supremacy over œcumenical as well as other councils ; in the third, which is entitled, ‘*De justâ prohibitione, et abolitione Librorum nocuæ Lectionis*,’ he maintains the right of the Pope

to forbid the reading of books dangerous to faith and morals, and refutes the opinion of those who deemed such reading lawful."

Passing over the wonderful performances of Francis di Girolamo, I will give two extracts from the life of John Joseph of the cross. According to his biographer, he seems to have been a pre-eminently favoured individual. The following miracles are recorded at p. 149.—"It was usual for our saint to be absorbed and rapt in heavenly ecstasies and visions. In this state he was lost to all that passed around him; seeing, hearing, and feeling nothing, he stood like a statue of marble, and when he was awakened, his countenance glowed like a burning coal. In a condition so closely resembling that of the blessed, he was, from time to time, made a partaker of their glories. Thus, during prayer, a halo of light often encircled his head; and, during mass, a supernatural brightness overspread his countenance. He was known to declare, in a moment of transport, that our blessed Lady had appeared to him and had spoken with him. **AND ON CHRISTMAS NIGHT, AND OTHER TIMES BESIDES, THE INFANT JESUS DESCENDED INTO HIS ARMS, PROLONGING HIS STAY FOR SEVERAL HOURS.** His frequent ravishments from the earth, and suspension in the air, was a well-known occurrence, visible to many who beheld him at mass, and, in a remarkable manner happened during a procession. Nor was that singular prerogative denied him, which God's saints have sometimes possessed, of appearing in two places at once, or of passing with the velocity of blessed spirits from one to another." Again, at p. 154,—"It remains to speak of the miracles of our saint, which surpass enumeration. First, he possessed a mighty empire over the evil spirits, which he expelled from divers persons. The part of the convent of Saint Lucy of the Mount, called the noviciate, was nightly infested by these wicked spirits, but our saint, by blessing the apartment, effectually dislodged them. Strange to say, after his death they attempted to return, but were driven away by the invocation of

his name. Even the elements obeyed him. Rain ceased at his command, when it was falling heavily so as to threaten to oblige him to seek shelter. Another time, journeying with a companion under an incessant shower, when they had reached their destination their garments were dry, as though they had walked under the sun all the way. All nature was obedient and subservient to him. The air bore to him on its wings his stick, which he had left behind; and the herbs, as we have seen, grew supernaturally to minister to his charity. Sometimes he wrought his miracles by simple prayer, frequently by making the sign of the cross, by the application of sacred relics or images, or of the oil burning before them.

“Nor less numerous were the cures effected by contact with things belonging to him, or with his person. A cloak of his delivered a person from a raging madness, judged to be incurable; the manner of which cure was extraordinary. His mother, holding up the mantle before him, he leaped from a high window into the street, and when all thought to find him dead and crushed to atoms, he was brought up alive and whole in body and mind, and so remained to the hour of his death. With a piece of the saint’s habit, Casimir Avellone cured his wife in London of a spasmodic affection in the shoulders, upon which every remedy had hitherto been tried in vain. By the contact of his person a certain nobleman was delivered from an acute pain in the head; he straightened the limbs of a child three years of age, and restored sight to a youth who had become blind, by the sole application of his hands.”

The biographer of Pacificus of San Severino, after having given some instances of his faculty of predicting future events, proceeds to say—“To these examples of the prophetic spirit of Pacificus, we might add many more, from the authentic acts of his beatification; but we think it more advisable to trace briefly some other proofs of the favour with which Almighty God regarded him, and of the manner in which his extraordinary sanctity was displayed to many. He was often raised, as before related,

several inches above the ground, during the celebration of the holy sacrifice; and, on one occasion, he remained elevated in ecstasy, with his arms stretched out, and his eyes raised towards heaven, for more than four hours, as was related by a person who was present. The religious who served his mass were often favoured with a sight of these ecstatic transports; but the fact most surprising to the beholders, as is mentioned in the processes, was, that while he was offering up the tremendous mysteries, his countenance not only changed from a pale to a florid hue, but shone with such supernatural brightness, that, upon the opposite wall, rays darting an unusual light were seen, which, as was observed by those who watched it purposely, could radiate from no other source than his face, because the sun was at that time hid with clouds, and concealed from sight,"—P. 212.

The miraculous career of Veronica Giuliani commenced from a very early period, as appears from the following passage. "Saint Veronica Giuliani was born on the feast of St. John the Evangelist, in 1660, at Mercatello, in the states of the Church. She received in baptism the name of Ursula, for God destined her, like our own holy martyr, to be a virgin and the leader of many other virgins to the kingdom of heaven. In her very infancy her future sanctity was foreshadowed; for on Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday, which the Church keeps as days of penance, she would never take nourishment, save a small quantity in the morning and evening: and before she was six months old, **SEEING A PICTURE REPRESENTING THE MOST BLESSED TRINITY**, to whose honour that day was dedicated (12th June, 1661,) she left her mother's arms of her own accord, and, without any assistance whatever, walked to it, and with many signs of reverence, remained as if enchanted before it; and being carried, at the age of a year and a half, to a shop, by a servant, who wanted some oil, in selling which the shopkeeper used a false measure, her tongue was loosed, and she cried out, in a clear voice, 'Act fairly, for God sees you.'"—P. 224.

According to her biographer the termination of her life was not less remarkable than it's beginning. "Veronica," says he, "foretold that twenty-four marks would be found engraven upon her heart; and, by the order of her confessor, she described the exact form and disposition of them, by cutting them out in red and white paper; and after her death, they were found to correspond in every particular with the account and picture which she had made of them. They were as follows:—a Latin cross, with a C in the top of the upright piece; the centre of the transverse an F; in the right point of the transverse a V; and in the left an O. Above the cross was, on one side, a crown of thorns; on the left of which was a banner upon a staff, which passed transversely over the cross, and the flag of the banner was divided into two tongues, on the upper of which was a large I, and on the lower an *m* in a running hand. At the top of the banner was a flame, and, lower down, a hammer, a pair of pincers, a lance, and a reed with a sponge represented upon the top. On the right of the cross, beginning from above, was a small garment to represent the seamless vest of our Lord, another flame, a chalice, two wounds, a column, three nails, a scourge, and seven swords; with the letters P. P. V. on other parts of the heart. All these marks were exactly described by her upon paper, which being compared with her heart, soon after death, were found to agree in every particular. Her confessor attests that the meaning of the above letters and emblems is:—The seven swords are the seven dolours of Mary; the banner, the ensign of her victories over the Devil, the world, and herself; the two letters, *I* (J) and *m*, Jesus and Mary; *C*, Charity; *F*, Faith and Fidelity to God; *O*, Obedience; the two *VV*, Humility and the Will of God (*Umiltà*, and *Volontà di Dio*;) *PP*, Patience and Suffering (*Patire*;) the two flames, the love of God and her neighbour."—P. 268.

Having thus presented the reader with some specimens of the *lying wonders* and legendary tales which are propagated by the Church of Rome in the 19th century, I will conclude the whole

with some extracts from the writings of Archbishop Usher; which possess a strong claim upon the serious attention of those misguided persons who have, either directly or indirectly, given any countenance to the unscriptural dogmas and idolatrous usages of that apostate Church, or have contributed to the political aggrandizement of its members.—“And lest the poor people, whom they have so miserably abused, should find how far they have been misled, we see that the masters of that Church do, in the service-books and catechisms which come unto the hands of the vulgar, generally leave out the words of the second commandment that make against the adoration of images, fearing lest by the light thereof the mystery of their iniquity should be discovered. They pretend, indeed, that this commandment is not excluded by them, but included only in the first; whereas in truth they do but craftily conceal it from the people’s eyes, because they would not have them to be ruled by it. Nay, Vasquez the Jesuit doth boldly acknowledge, that it plainly appeareth by comparing the words of this commandment with the place which hath been alleged out of the fourth of Deuteronomy, that the Scripture did not only forbid the worshipping of an image for God, but also the adoration of the true God himself in an image. He confesseth further, that he and his fellow-Catholics do otherwise. What saith he then to the commandment, think you? Because it will not be obeyed it must be repealed, and not admitted to have any place among the moral precepts of God. It was, saith he, a positive and ceremonial law, and therefore ought to cease in the time of the Gospel. And as if it had not been enough for him to match the scribes and Pharisees in impiety, who *made the commandment of God of none effect, that they might keep their own tradition*, that he might fulfil the measure of his fathers, and shew himself to be a true child of her who beareth the name of being *the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth*, he is yet more mad, and sticketh not to maintain, that not only a painted image, but any other thing of the world, whether it be

without life and reason, or whether it be a reasonable creature, may (in the nature of the thing, and if the matter be discreetly handled) be adored with God, as his image; yea, and counteth it no absurdity at all, that a very wisp of straw should be thus worshipped.

“ But let us *turn yet again*, and we shall see *greater abominations than these*. We heard how this blessed Sacrament, which is here propounded by the Apostle as a bond to unite Christians together in one body, hath been made the apple of strife, and the occasion of most bitter breaches in the Church: we may now observe again, that the same holy Sacrament, which by the same Apostle is here brought in as a principal inducement to make men *flee from idolatry*, is by our adversaries made the object of the grossest idolatry that ever hath been practised by any. For their constant doctrine is, that in worshipping the Sacrament they should give unto it *latriæ cultum qui vero Deo debetur*, as the Council of Trent hath determined, “ that kind of service which is due to the true God; ” determining their worship in that very thing which the priest doth hold betwixt his hands. Their practice also runs accordingly; for an instance whereof we need go no farther than to Sander’s book of the Lord’s Supper, before which he hath prefixed an epistle dedicatory, superscribed in this manner: ‘ To the body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ, under the forms of bread and wine, all honour, praise, and thanks be given for ever: ’ adding further in the process of that blockish epistle, ‘ Howsoever it be with other men, I adore thee, my God and Lord really present under the forms of bread and wine, after consecration duly made; beseeching of thee pardon for my sins, &c. ’

“ Now, if the conceit which these men have concerning the Sacrament should prove to be false, (as indeed we know it to be most absurd and monstrous), their own Jesuit Cqster doth freely confess, that they should be in such an ‘ error and idolatry, *qualis in orbe terrarum nunquam vel visus vel auditus fuit*, as

never was seen or heard of in this world.' 'For the error of them is more tolerable,' saith he, 'who worship for God a statue of gold or silver, or an image of any other matter, as the Gentiles adored their gods; or a red cloth lifted up upon a spear, as it is reported of the Lappians; or living creatures, as did sometime the Egyptians; than of those that worship a piece of bread.' We, therefore, who are verily persuaded that the Papists do thus, must of force, if we follow their Jesuit's direction, judge them to be the most intolerable idolators that ever were." * * *

"These, then, being the idolators with whom we have to deal, let us learn, *first*, how dangerous a thing it is to communicate with them in their false worship: for if we will be partakers of Babylon's sins, we must look to receive of her plagues. *Secondly*, we are to be admonished, that it is not sufficient that in our own persons we refrain from worshipping of idols, but it is further required that we restrain, as much as in us lieth, the practice thereof in others; lest by suffering God to be dishonoured in so high a matter, when we may by our calling hinder it, we make ourselves partakers of other men's sins. Eli the high priest was a good man, and gave excellent counsel unto his lewd sons; yet we know what judgment fell upon him, *because his sons made themselves vile, and he frowned not upon them*, that is, restrained them not, which God doth interpret to be a kind of idolatry in *honouring of his sons above him*. The Church of Pergamus did for her own part hold fast Christ's name, and denied not his faith; yet had the Lord something against her, *because she had there them that held the doctrine of Balaam, who taught Balak to cast a stumblingblock before the children of Israel, to eat things sacrificed unto idols, and to commit fornication*. So we see what special notice our Saviour taketh of the works, and charity, and service, and faith, and patience of the Church of Thyatira; and yet for all this he addeth, *Notwithstanding I have a few things against thee, because thou sufferest that woman Jezebel, which calleth herself a prophetess, to teach and to seduce my*

servants to commit fornication, and to eat things sacrificed unto idols." * * * *

"And whereas for the discovery of such wicked spirits his Majesty, in his princely wisdom, did cause an Oath of Allegiance to be framed, by the tendering whereof he might be the better able to distinguish betwixt his loyal and disloyal subjects, and to put a difference betwixt a seditious and a quiet-minded Romanist; this companion derideth his simplicity in imagining that that will serve the turn, and supposing that a Papist will think himself any whit bound by taking such an oath: 'See,' saith he, 'in so great craft how great simplicity doth bewray itself. When he had placed all his security in that oath, he thought he had found such a manner of oath, knit with so many circumstances, that it could not, with safety of conscience, by any means be dissolved by any man. But he could not see, that if the Pope did dissolve that oath, all the tyings of it, whether of performing fidelity to the king or of admitting no dispensation, would be dissolved together. Yea, I will say another thing that is more admirable: you know, I believe, that an unjust oath, if it be evidently known or openly declared to be such, bindeth no man, but is void *ipso facto*. That the king's oath is unjust, hath been sufficiently declared by the pastor of the Church himself. You see, therefore, that the obligation of it is vanished into smoke; so that the bond, which by so many wise men was thought to be of iron, is become less than of straw.'

"If matters now be come unto this pass, that such as are addicted to the Pope will account the Oath of Allegiance to have less force to bind them than a rope of straw, judge ye whether that be not true which hath been said, that in respect not of spiritual infection only, but of outward danger also to our state, any idolators may be more safely permitted than Papists. Which I do not speak to exasperate you against their persons, or to stir you up to make new laws for shedding of their blood. Their blindness I do much pity, and my heart's desire and prayer to

God for them is that they might be saved. Only this I must say, that, things standing as they do, I cannot preach peace unto them. For as Jehu said to Joram, *What peace, so long as the whoredoms of thy mother Jezebel and her witchcrafts are so many?* so must I say unto them, What peace can there be, so long as you suffer yourselves to be led by the *mother of harlots and abominations of the earth*, who by her sorceries hath deceived all nations, and made them *drunk with the wine of her fornication?* Let her *put away her whoredoms out of her sight, and her adulteries from between her breasts*; let her repent of her murders, and her sorceries, and her idolatries; or rather, because she is past all hope, let those that are seduced by her cease to communicate with her in these abominable iniquities, and we shall be all ready to meet them, and rejoice with the angels in heaven for their conversion. In the mean time, they who sit at the helm, and have the charge of our Church and commonwealth committed to them, must provide by all good means, that God be not dishonoured by their open idolatries, nor our king and state endangered by their secret treacheries. Good laws there are already enacted to this purpose, which, if they were duly put in execution, we should have less need to think of making new. But it is not my part to press this point. I will therefore conclude as I did begin: *I speak as to wise men, judge ye what I say.*—Usher's Answer to a Jesuit; and other Tracts, pp. 679, 682, 687.







